TEXT-BOOKS

OF THE

AMERICAN LYCEUM CIRCLE

THE

WORLD'S BEST ORATIONS

FROM THE

EARLIEST PERIOD TO THE PRESENT TIME

DAVID J. BREWER

EDITOR

EDWARD A. ALLEN WILLIAM SCHUYLER

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

TEN VOLUMES

VOL. 7

ST. LOUIS

FERD. P. KAISER

1901

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT TYLER
LIBRARY

Copyright 1899
BY
FERD. P. KAISER

All rights reserved

Copyright 1901
BY
FERD. P. KAISER

All rights reserved

J. B. LYON COMPANY
PRINTERS AND BINDERS
ALBANY, N. Y.

THE ADVISORY COUNCIL

THE RIGHT HON. SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE, Bart.,
Member of Parliament—Author of 'Greater Britain,' etc.,
London, England

WILLIAM DRAPER LEWIS, PH. D.,
Dean of the Department of Law,
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, Philadelphia.

WILLIAM P. TRENT, M. A.,
Professor of English and History,
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, in the city of New York.

W. STUART SYMINGTON, JR., PH. D.,
Professor of the Romance Languages,
AMHERST COLLEGE, Amherst, Mass.

ALCÉE FORTIER, LIT. D.,
Professor of the Romance Languages,
TULANE UNIVERSITY, New Orleans, La.

WILLIAM VINCENT BYARS,
Journalist, St. Louis, Mo.

RICHARD GOTTHEIL, PH. D.,
Professor of Oriental Languages,
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, in the city of New York.

AUSTIN H. MERRILL, A. M.,
Professor of Elocution, VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY, Nashville, Tenn.

SHELDON JACKSON, D. D., LL. D.,
Bureau of Education, Washington, D. C.

A. MARSHALL ELLIOTT, PH. D., LL. D.,
Professor of the Romance Languages,
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, Baltimore, Md.

JOHN W. MILLION, A. M.,
President of HARDIN COLLEGE, Mexico, Mo.

J. RAYMOND BRACKETT, PH. D.,
Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, and Professor of Comparative Literature, UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO, Boulder, Colo.

WILLIAM F. PEIRCE, A.M., L.H.D.,
President of KENYON COLLEGE, Gambier, Ohio.

S. PLANTZ, PH. D., D. D.,
President of LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY, Appleton, Wis.

GEORGE TAYLOE WINSTON, LL. D.,
President of the UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, Austin, Texas.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME VII

	LIVED	PAGE
HAYES, RUTHERFORD B.	1822–1893	2433
Inaugural Address		
HAYNE, ROBERT YOUNG	1791–1839	2441
On Foot's Resolution		
HAZLITT, WILLIAM	1778–1830	2449
On Wit and Humor		
HECKER, FREDERICK KARL FRANZ	1811–1881	2456
Liberty in the New Atlantis		
HELMHOLTZ, HERMANN LUDWIG FERDINAND VON	1821–1894	2465
The Mystery of Creation		
HENRY, PATRICK	1736–1799	2473
"Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death"		
"We the People" or "We the States?"		
"A Nation,—Not a Federation"		
The Bill of Rights		
Liberty or Empire?		
HERDER, JOHANN GOTTFRIED VON	1744–1803	2497
The Meaning of Inspiration		
HILDEBERT, ARCHBISHOP OF TOURS	*c.* 1055–1134	2502
Rebecca at the Well		
HILL, BENJAMIN HARVEY	1823–1882	2507
"A Little Personal History"		
HOAR, GEORGE FRISBIE	1826–	2516
The Great Men of Massachusetts		

	LIVED	PAGE
HOLBORNE, SIR ROBERT	*c.* 1594–1647	2524
In Defense of John Hampden		
HOUSTON, SAMUEL	1793–1863	2529
On His Defeat as a Union Candidate		
His Defense at the Bar of the House		
HUGHES, THOMAS	1823–1896	2539
The Highest Manhood		
HUGO, VICTOR	1802–1885	2545
Oration on Honoré de Balzac		
The Liberty Tree in Paris		
On the Centennial of Voltaire's Death		
Moral Force in World Politics		
HUXLEY, THOMAS HENRY	1825–1895	2556
The Threefold Unity of Life		
HYDE, EDWARD, EARL OF CLARENDON	1608–1674	2562
"Discretion" as Despotism		
In John Hampden's Case		
INDIAN ORATORS		2567
TECUMSEH — Address to General Proctor		
LOGAN — Speech on the Murder of His Family		
OLD TASSEL — His Plea for His Home		
WEATHERFORD — Speech to General Jackson		
RED JACKET — Missionary Effort		
INGALLS, JOHN J.	1833–	2574
The Undiscovered Country		
INGERSOLL, ROBERT G.	1833–1899	2577
Blaine, the Plumed Knight		
Oration at His Brother's Grave		
A Picture of War		
The Grave of Napoleon		
The Imagination		
Life		
ISOCRATES	436–338 B. C.	2589
'Areopagiticus'—"A Few Wise Laws Wisely Administered"		

	LIVED	PAGE
JACKSON, ANDREW	1767–1845	2596
Second Inaugural Address — State Rights and Federal Sovereignty		
JAY, JOHN	1745–1829	2601
Protest against Colonial Government		
JEFFERSON, THOMAS	1743–1826	2611
"Jeffersonian Democracy" Defined		
JEKYLL, SIR JOSEPH	1663–1738	2617
Resistance to Unlawful Authority		
JOHNSON, ANDREW	1808–1875	2626
Inaugural Address		
The St. Louis Speech for which He Was Impeached		
At Cleveland in 1866		
KING, RUFUS	1755–1827	2642
For Federal Government by the People		
KINGSLEY, CHARLES	1819–1875	2645
Human Soot		
KNOTT, J. PROCTOR	1830–	2652
The Glories of Duluth		
KNOX, JOHN	1505–1572	2665
Against Tyrants		
KOSSUTH, LOUIS	1802–1894	2672
Local Self-Government		
LABORI, MAITRE FERNAND	*c.* 1859–	2683
The Conspiracy against Dreyfus		
LACORDAIRE, JEAN BAPTISTE HENRI	1802–1861	2692
The Sacred Cause of the Human Race		
Rationalism and Miracles		
LAMARTINE, ALPHONSE MARIE LOUIS	1790–1869	2702
The Revolution of 1848		

	LIVED	PAGE
LANSING, JOHN	1754–1829	2710
Answering Alexander Hamilton		
LARDNER, DIONYSIUS	1793–1859	2716
The Plurality of Worlds		
LATIMER, HUGH	*c.* 1490–1555	2720
Duties and Respect of Judges		
The Sermon of the Plow		
On the Pickings of Officeholders		
LAURIER, SIR WILFRID	1841–	2731
The Character and Work of Gladstone		
Canada, England, and the United States in 1899		
LEE, HENRY	1756–1818	2744
Funeral Oration for Washington		
LEE, RICHARD HENRY	1732–1794	2752
Address to the People of England		
LEIGHTON, ROBERT	1611–1684	2761
Immortality		
LENTHALL, WILLIAM	1591–1662	2767
Opening the Long Parliament under Charles I.		
LEWIS, DAVID, BISHOP OF LLANDAFF	1617–1679	2771
His Speech on the Scaffold		
LINCOLN, ABRAHAM	1809–1865	2775
The House Divided against Itself		
Interrogating Douglas		
On John Brown		
The Gettysburg Address		
Second Inaugural Address		
His Speech before Death		
LIVINGSTON, ROBERT R.	1746–1813	2801
Wealth and Poverty, Aristocracy and Republicanism		
LOWELL, JAMES RUSSELL	1819–1891	2808
The Poetical and the Practical in America		
Pope and His Times		

	LIVED	PAGE
LUBBOCK, SIR JOHN	1834–	2819
The Hundred Best Books		
LUTHER, MARTIN	1483–1546	2828
Address to the Diet at Worms		
"The Pith of Paul's Chief Doctrine"		
LYNDHURST, LORD	1772–1863	2842
Russia and the Crimean War		

FULL-PAGE ILLUSTRATIONS

VOLUME VII

	PAGE
Patrick Henry Delivering His Speech of 1765 (Photogravure)	Frontispiece
Victor Hugo (Portrait, Photogravure)	2545
Sir Wilfrid Laurier (Portrait, Photogravure)	2731
Lincoln and His Early Home (Photogravure)	2775

RUTHERFORD B. HAYES

(1822–1893)

RUTHERFORD BIRCHARD HAYES, nineteenth President of the United States, made his administration memorable as the turning point beyond which national politics diverged more and more from the direction given by the sectional contest over slavery. He was born at Delaware, Ohio, October 4th, 1822, and during the Civil War served in the Union army with such distinction that in 1865 he was brevetted Major-General. From 1865 to 1867 he represented an Ohio district in Congress, and was Governor of Ohio from 1868 to 1872. His candidacy for the Presidency against Samuel J. Tilden, in 1876, resulted in an election so nearly drawn that the novel method of an electoral commission was required to decide the result. When the decision of the commission made Mr. Hayes President, he accepted the trust with a determination to restore the Union morally by re-establishing good feeling,— if that were possible,— as in the face of the intense sectional bitterness of the times many might have doubted it to be. Attacked by the opponents of his party as no other President had been, Mr. Hayes challenged a scarcely less envenomed attack from the extremists of his own party by his action in withdrawing all military influence from the Southern States and leaving them to assert themselves through their State governments, under the amended Constitution as they had done prior to 1860. As a result of this policy, President Hayes left the White House in deep disfavor with the majority of both parties, denounced by Democrats for accepting the Presidency at all, and by Republicans for using its authority to «restore rebels to the control of the Union.» In spite of this, Mr. Hayes waited with uncomplaining and unwearying patience what he expected would be the favorable judgment of less prejudiced times. The historian passing on his administration cannot fail to acknowledge that no matter by whom the Union was preserved in form, he made possible its restoration as a fact. He died January 17th, 1893, after surviving most of the prejudice which condemned him, and living to see his moderation and devotion to the principles of civil government indorsed by a larger majority of all parties than had attacked him during his administration.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

Fellow-Citizens:—

We have assembled to repeat the public ceremonial, begun by Washington, observed by all my predecessors, and now a time-honored custom, which marks the commencement of a new term of the Presidential office. Called to the duties of this great trust, I proceed, in compliance with usage, to announce some of the leading principles on the subjects that now chiefly engage the public attention, by which it is my desire to be guided in the discharge of those duties. I shall not undertake to lay down irrevocably principles or measures of administration, but rather to speak of the motives which should animate us, and to suggest certain important ends to be attained in accordance with our institutions as essential to the welfare of our country.

At the outset of the discussions which preceded the recent Presidential election, it seemed to me fitting that I should fully make known my sentiments in regard to several of the important questions which then appeared to demand the consideration of the country. Following the example, and in part adopting the language of one of my predecessors, I wish now, when every motive for misrepresentation has passed away, to repeat what was said before the election, trusting that my countrymen will candidly weigh and understand it, and that they will feel assured that the sentiments declared in accepting the nomination for the Presidency will be the standard of my conduct in the path before me, charged, as I now am, with the grave and difficult task of carrying them out in the practical administration of the Government so far as depends, under the Constitution and laws, on the Chief Executive of the nation.

The permanent pacification of the country upon such principles and by such measures as will secure the complete protection of all its citizens in the free enjoyment of all their constitutional rights is now the one subject in our public affairs which all thoughtful and patriotic citizens regard as of supreme importance.

Many of the calamitous effects of the tremendous revolution which has passed over the Southern States still remain. The immeasurable benefits which will surely follow, sooner or later, the hearty and generous acceptance of the legitimate results of that revolution have not yet been realized. Difficult and embarrassing

questions meet us at the threshold of this subject. The people of those States are still impoverished, and the inestimable blessing of wise, honest, and peaceful local self-government is not fully enjoyed. Whatever difference of opinion may exist as to the cause of this condition of things, the fact is clear that in the progress of events the time has come when such government is the imperative necessity required by all the varied interests, public and private, of those States. But it must not be forgotten that only a local government which recognizes and maintains inviolate the rights of all is a true self-government.

With respect to the two distinct races whose peculiar relations to each other have brought upon us the deplorable complications and perplexities which exist in those States, it must be a government which guards the interests of both races carefully and equally. It must be a government which submits loyally and heartily to the Constitution and the laws,—the laws of the nation and the laws of the States themselves,—accepting and obeying faithfully the whole Constitution as it is.

Resting upon this sure and substantial foundation, the superstructure of beneficent local governments can be built up, and not otherwise. In furtherance of such obedience to the letter and the spirit of the Constitution, and in behalf of all that its attainment implies, all so-called party interests lose their apparent importance, and party lines may well be permitted to fade into insignificance. The question we have to consider for the immediate welfare of those States of the Union is the question of government or no government; of social order and all the peaceful industries and the happiness that belong to it, or a return to barbarism. It is a question in which every citizen of the nation is deeply interested, and with respect to which we ought not to be, in a partisan sense, either Republicans or Democrats, but fellow-citizens and fellow-men, to whom the interests of a common country and a common humanity are dear.

The sweeping revolution of the entire labor system of a large portion of our country and the advance of four million people from a condition of servitude to that of citizenship, upon an equal footing with their former masters, could not occur without presenting problems of the gravest moment, to be dealt with by the emancipated race, by their former masters, and by the General Government, the author of the Act of Emancipation. That it was

a wise, just, and providential act, fraught with good for all concerned, is now generally conceded throughout the country. That a moral obligation rests upon the National Government to employ its constitutional power and influence to establish the rights of the people it has emancipated, and to protect them in the enjoyment of those rights when they are infringed or assailed, is also generally admitted.

The evils which afflict the Southern States can only be removed or remedied by the united and harmonious efforts of both races, actuated by motives of mutual sympathy and regard; and while in duty bound and fully determined to protect the rights of all by every constitutional means at the disposal of my administration, I am sincerely anxious to use every legitimate influence in favor of honest and efficient local self-government as the true resource of those States for the promotion of the contentment and prosperity of their citizens. In the effort I shall make to accomplish this purpose, I ask the cordial co-operation of all who cherish an interest in the welfare of the country, trusting that party ties and the prejudice of race will be freely surrendered in behalf of the great purpose to be accomplished. In the important work of restoring the South, it is not the political situation alone that merits attention. The material development of that section of the country has been arrested by the social and political revolution through which it has passed, and now needs and deserves the considerate care of the National Government within the just limits prescribed by the Constitution and wise public economy.

But at the basis of all prosperity, for that as well as for every other part of the country, lies the improvement of the intellectual and moral condition of the people. Universal suffrage should rest upon universal education. To this end liberal and permanent provision should be made for the support of free schools by the State governments, and, if need be, supplemented by legitimate aid from national authority.

Let me assure my countrymen of the Southern States that it is my earnest desire to regard and promote their truest interests, — the interests of the white and of the colored people, both and equally, — and to put forth my best efforts in behalf of a civil policy which will forever wipe out in our political affairs the color line and the distinction between North and South, to the

end that we may have, not merely a united North or a united South, but a united country.

I ask the attention of the public to the paramount necessity of reform in our civil service — a reform not merely as to certain abuses and practices of so-called official patronage, which have come to have the sanction of usage in the several departments of our Government, but a change in the system of appointment itself; a reform that shall be thorough, radical, and complete; a return to the principles and practices of the founders of the government. They neither expected nor desired from public officers any partisan service. They meant that public officers should owe their whole service to the Government and to the people. They meant that the officer should be secure in his tenure as long as his personal character remained untarnished and the performance of his duties satisfactory. They held that appointments to office were not to be made or expected merely as rewards for partisan services, nor merely on the nomination of members of Congress, as being entitled in any respect to the control of such appointments.

The fact that both the great political parties of the country, in declaring their principles prior to the election, gave a prominent place to the subject of reform of our civil service, recognizing and strongly urging its necessity, in terms almost identical in their specific import with those I have here employed, must be accepted as a conclusive argument in behalf of these measures. It must be regarded as the expression of the united voice and will of the whole country upon this subject, and both political parties are virtually pledged to give it their unreserved support.

The President of the United States of necessity owes his election to office to the suffrage and zealous labors of a political party the members of which cherish with ardor and regard as of essential importance the principles of their party organizations; but he should strive to be always mindful of the fact that he serves his party best who serves the country best.

In furtherance of the reform we seek, and in other important respects a change of great importance, I recommend an amendment to the Constitution prescribing a term of six years for the Presidential office and forbidding a re-election.

With respect to the financial condition of the country, I shall not attempt an extended history of the embarrassment and pros-

tration which we have suffered during the past three years. The depression in all our varied commercial and manufacturing interests throughout the country, which began in September 1873, still continues. It is very gratifying, however, to be able to say that there are indications all around us of a coming change to prosperous times.

Upon the currency question, intimately connected as it is with this topic, I may be permitted to repeat here the statement made in my letter of acceptance, that in my judgment the feeling of uncertainty inseparable from an irredeemable paper currency, with its fluctuation of values, is one of the greatest obstacles to a return to prosperous times. The only safe paper currency is one which rests upon a coin basis and is at all times and promptly convertible into coin.

I adhere to the views heretofore expressed by me in favor of congressional legislation in behalf of an early resumption of specie payments, and I am satisfied, not only that this is wise, but that the interests, as well as the public sentiment, of the country imperatively demand it.

Passing from these remarks upon the condition of our own country to consider our relations with other lands, we are reminded by the international complications abroad, threatening the peace of Europe, that our traditional rule of noninterference in the affairs of foreign nations has proved of great value in past times and ought to be strictly observed.

The policy inaugurated by my honored predecessor, President Grant, of submitting to arbitration grave questions in dispute between ourselves and foreign powers points to a new, and incomparably the best, instrumentality for the preservation of peace, and will, as I believe, become a beneficent example of the course to be pursued in similar emergencies by other nations.

If, unhappily, questions of difference should at any time during the period of my administration arise between the United States and any foreign government, it will certainly be my disposition and my hope to aid in their settlement in the same peaceful and honorable way, thus securing to our country the great blessings of peace and mutual good offices with all the nations of the world.

Fellow-citizens, we have reached the close of a political contest marked by the excitement which usually attends the contests

between great political parties whose members espouse and advocate with earnest faith their respective creeds. The circumstances were, perhaps, in no respect extraordinary, save in the closeness and the consequent uncertainty of the result.

For the first time in the history of the country, it has been deemed best, in view of the peculiar circumstances of the case, that the objections and questions in dispute with reference to the counting of the electoral votes should be referred to the decision of a tribunal appointed for this purpose.

That tribunal — established by law for this sole purpose; its members, all of them, men of long-established reputation for integrity and intelligence, and, with the exception of those who are also members of the supreme judiciary, chosen equally from both political parties; its deliberations enlightened by the research and the arguments of able counsel — was entitled to the fullest confidence of the American people. Its decisions have been patiently waited for, and accepted as legally conclusive by the general judgment of the public. For the present, opinion will widely vary as to the wisdom of the several conclusions announced by that tribunal. This is to be anticipated in every instance where matters of dispute are made the subject of arbitration under the forms of law. Human judgment is never unerring, and is rarely regarded as otherwise than wrong by the unsuccessful party in the contest.

The fact that two great political parties have in this way settled a dispute in regard to which good men differ as to the facts and the law no less than as to the proper course to be pursued in solving the question in controversy is an occasion for general rejoicing.

Upon one point there is entire unanimity in public sentiment — that conflicting claims to the Presidency must be amicably and peaceably adjusted, and that when so adjusted the general acquiescence of the nation ought surely to follow.

It has been reserved for a government of the people, where the right of suffrage is universal, to give to the world the first example in history of a great nation, in the midst of the struggle of opposing parties for power, hushing its party tumults to yield the issue of the contest to adjustment according to the forms of law.

Looking for the guidance of that Divine Hand by which the destinies of nations and individuals are shaped, I call upon you,

senators, representatives, judges, fellow-citizens, here and everywhere, to unite with me in an earnest effort to secure to our country the blessings, not only of material prosperity, but of justice, peace, and union — a union depending, not upon the constraint of force, but upon the loving devotion of a free people; "and that all things may be so ordered and settled upon the best and surest foundations that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety, may be established among us for all generations."

ROBERT Y. HAYNE

(1791–1839)

ROBERT Y. HAYNE, famous as Calhoun's lieutenant in the Nullification controversy, was born in South Carolina, November 10th, 1791. He studied law under Langdon Cheves and in 1814 was elected to the South Carolina Legislature, of which, in 1818, he became Speaker. After serving as Attorney-General of the State, he was elected to the United States Senate in 1822. Serving ten years in that body, he retired in 1832, in the midst of his celebrity, to become Governor of South Carolina and to allow his friend and leader, John C. Calhoun, opportunity to succeed him in the Senate. The speech which made Mr. Hayne celebrated was delivered on the Foot Resolution and in reply to Webster. It still retains its historical interest, though supplanted as an exposition of the "Carolina doctrine" by Calhoun's great speech against the Force Bill. Hayne died at Asheville, North Carolina, September 24th, 1839.

ON FOOT'S RESOLUTION

(Peroration of His Speech of January 21st, 1830, Answering Webster)

THE Senator from Massachusetts, in denouncing what he is pleased to call the Carolina doctrine, has attempted to throw ridicule upon the idea that a State has any constitutional remedy, by the exercise of its sovereign authority, against "a gross, palpable, and deliberate violation of the Constitution." He calls it "an idle" or "ridiculous notion," or something to that effect, and adds that it would make the Union "a mere rope of sand." Now, sir, as the gentleman has not condescended to enter into any examination of the question, and has been satisfied with throwing the weight of his authority into the scale, I do not deem it necessary to do more than to throw into the opposite scale the authority on which South Carolina relies; and there, for the present, I am perfectly willing to leave the controversy. The South Carolina doctrine, that is to say, the doctrine contained in an exposition reported by a committee of the

legislature in December 1828, and published by their authority, is the good old Republican doctrine of 1798 — the doctrine of the celebrated 'Virginia Resolutions' of that year, and of 'Madison's Report' of 1799. It will be recollected that the legislature of Virginia, in December 1798, took into consideration the Alien and Sedition Laws, then considered by all Republicans as a gross violation of the Constitution of the United States, and on that day passed, among others, the following resolutions: —

"The General Assembly doth explicitly and peremptorily declare that it views the powers of the Federal Government as resulting from the compact to which the States are parties, as limited by the plain sense and intention of the instrument constituting that compact, as no further valid than they are authorized by the grants enumerated in that compact; and that in case of a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of other powers not granted by the said compact, the States who are parties thereto have the right, and are in duty bound, to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining, within their respective limits, the authorities, rights, and liberties appertaining to them."

In addition to the above resolution, the General Assembly of Virginia "appealed to the other States, in the confidence that they would concur with that Commonwealth that the acts aforesaid [the Alien and Sedition Laws] are unconstitutional, and that the necessary and proper measures would be taken by each for co-operating with Virginia in maintaining, unimpaired, the authorities, rights, and liberties reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The legislatures of several of the New England States having, contrary to the expectation of the legislature of Virginia, expressed their dissent from these doctrines, the subject came up again for consideration during the session of 1799–1800, when it was referred to a select committee, by whom was made that celebrated report which is familiarly known as 'Madison's Report,' and which deserves to last as long as the Constitution itself. In that report, which was subsequently adopted by the legislature, the whole subject was deliberately re-examined, and the objections urged against the Virginia doctrines carefully considered. The result was that the legislature of Virginia reaffirmed all the principles laid down in the resolutions of 1798, and issued to the world that admirable report which has stamped

the character of Mr. Madison as the preserver of that Constitution which he had contributed so largely to create and establish. I will here quote from Mr. Madison's Report one or two passages which bear more immediately on the point in controversy: —

"The resolution, having taken this view of the Federal compact, proceeds to infer 'that in case of a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of other powers not granted by the said compact, the States who are parties thereto have the right and are in duty bound, to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining within their respective limits the authorities, rights, and liberties appertaining to them.'

"It appears to your committee to be a plain principle, founded in common sense, illustrated by common practice, and essential to the nature of compacts, that, where resort can be had to no tribunal, superior to the authority of the parties, the parties themselves must be the rightful judges in the last resort whether the bargain made has been pursued or violated. The Constitution of the United States was formed by the sanction of the States, given by each in its sovereign capacity. It adds to the stability and dignity, as well as to the authority of the Constitution, that it rests upon this legitimate and solid foundation. The States, then, being the parties to the constitutional compact, and in their sovereign capacity, it follows of necessity that there can be no tribunal above their authority, to decide, in the last resort, whether the compact made by them be violated; and, consequently, that, as the parties to it, they must themselves decide, in the last resort, such questions as may be of sufficient magnitude to require their interposition.

"The resolution has guarded against any misapprehension of its object by expressly requiring for such an interposition 'the case of a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous breach of the Constitution, by the exercise of powers not granted by it.' It must be a case, not of a light and transient nature, but of a nature dangerous to the great purposes for which the Constitution was established.

"But the resolution has done more than guard against misconstruction by expressly referring to cases of a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous nature. It specifies the object of the interposition which it contemplates to be solely that of arresting the progress of the evil of usurpation, and of maintaining the authorities, rights, and liberties appertaining to the States, as parties to the Constitution.

"From this view of the resolution it would seem inconceivable that it can incur any just disapprobation from those who, laying aside all momentary impressions, and recollecting the genuine source

and object of the Federal Constitution, shall candidly and accurately interpret the meaning of the General Assembly. If the deliberate exercise of dangerous powers, palpably withheld by the Constitution, could not justify the parties to it in interposing, even so far as to arrest the progress of the evil, and thereby to preserve the Constitution itself, as well as to provide for the safety of the parties to it, there would be an end to all relief from usurped power, and a direct subversion of the rights specified or recognized under all the State constitutions, as well as a plain denial of the fundamental principles on which our independence itself was declared.»

But, sir, our authorities do not stop here. The State of Kentucky responded to Virginia, and on the tenth of November, 1798, adopted those celebrated resolutions, well known to have been penned by the author of the Declaration of American Independence. In those resolutions, the legislature of Kentucky declare that —

«The Government created by this compact was not made the exclusive or final judge of the extent of the powers delegated to itself, since that would have made its discretion, and not the Constitution, the measure of its powers; but that, as in all other cases of compact among parties having no common judge, each party has an equal right to judge for itself as well of infractions as of the mode and measure of redress.»

At the ensuing session of the legislature, the subject was reexamined, and on the fourteenth of November, 1799, the resolutions of the preceding year were deliberately reaffirmed, and it was, among other things, solemnly declared: —

«That if those who administer the General Government be permitted to transgress the limits fixed by that compact, by a total disregard to the special delegations of power therein contained, an annihilation of the State governments, and the erection upon their ruins of a general consolidated government, will be the inevitable consequence. That the principles of construction contended for by sundry of the State legislatures, that the General Government is the exclusive judge of the extent of the powers delegated to it, stop nothing short of despotism; since the discretion of those who administer the Government, and not the Constitution, would be the measure of their powers. That the several States who formed that instrument, being sovereign and independent, have the unquestionable right to judge of its infraction, and that a nullification by those sovereignties

of all unauthorized acts done under color of that instrument is the rightful remedy."

Time and experience confirmed Mr. Jefferson's opinion on this all-important point. In the year 1821 he expressed himself in this emphatic manner:—

"It is a fatal heresy to suppose that either our State governments are superior to the Federal, or the Federal to the State; neither is authorized literally to decide which belongs to itself or its copartner in government. In differences of opinion between their different sets of public servants, the appeal is to neither, but to their employers peaceably assembled by their representatives in convention."

The opinion of Mr. Jefferson on this subject has been so repeatedly and so solemnly expressed, that it may be said to have been among the most fixed and settled convictions of his mind.

In the protest prepared by him for the legislature of Virginia, in December 1825, in respect to the powers exercised by the Federal Government in relation to the tariff and internal improvements, which he declares to be "usurpations of the powers retained by the States, mere interpolations into the compact, and direct infractions of it," he solemnly reasserts all the principles of the Virginia Resolutions of 1798 — protests against "these acts of the Federal branch of the Government as null and void, and declares that, although Virginia would consider a dissolution of the Union as among the greatest calamities that could befall them, yet it is not the greatest. There is one yet greater — submission to a government of unlimited powers. It is only when the hope of this shall become absolutely desperate that further forbearance could not be indulged."

In his letter to Mr. Giles, written about the same time, he says:—

"I see, as you do, and with the deepest affliction, the rapid strides with which the Federal branch of our Government is advancing towards the usurpation of all the rights reserved to the States, and the consolidation in itself of all powers, foreign and domestic, and that, too, by constructions which leave no limits to their powers, etc. Under the power to regulate commerce, they assume, indefinitely, that also over agriculture and manufactures, etc. Under the authority to establish post-roads, they claim that of cutting down mountains for the construction of roads and digging canals, etc. And what is our

resource for the preservation of the Constitution? Reason and argument? You might as well reason and argue with the marble columns encircling them, etc. Are we then to stand to our arms with the hot-headed Georgian? No [and I say no, and South Carolina has said no]; that must be the last resource. We must have patience and long endurance with our brethren, etc., and separate from our companions only when the sole alternatives left are a dissolution of our union with them, or submission to a government without limitation of powers. Between these two evils, when we must make a choice, there can be no hesitation."

Such, sir, are the high and imposing authorities in support of the "Carolina doctrine," which is, in fact, the doctrine of the Virginia resolutions of 1798.

Sir, at that day the whole country was divided on this very question. It formed the line of demarcation between the Federal and Republican parties; and the great political revolution which then took place turned upon the very question involved in these resolutions. That question was decided by the people, and by that decision the Constitution was, in the emphatic language of Mr. Jefferson, "saved at its last gasp." I should suppose, sir, it would require more self-respect than any gentleman here would be willing to assume, to treat lightly doctrines derived from such high sources. Resting on authority like this, I will ask gentlemen whether South Carolina has not manifested a high regard for the Union, when, under a tyranny ten times more grievous than the Alien and Sedition Laws she has hitherto gone no further than to petition, to remonstrate, and to solemnly protest against a series of measures which she believes to be wholly unconstitutional and utterly destructive of her interests. Sir, South Carolina has not gone one step further than Mr. Jefferson himself was disposed to go in relation to the present subject of our present complaints; not a step further than the statesmen from New England were disposed to go under similar circumstances; no further than the Senator from Massachusetts himself once considered as within "the limits of a constitutional opposition." The doctrine that it is the right of a State to judge of the violations of the Constitution on the part of the Federal Government, and to protect her citizens from the operations of unconstitutional laws, was held by the enlightened citizens of Boston, who assembled in Faneuil Hall on the twenty-fifth of January, 1809. They state, in that celebrated memorial, that "they looked only to the

State legislature, who were competent to devise relief against the unconstitutional acts of the General Government. That your power [say they] is adequate to that object is evident from the organization of the confederacy."

A distinguished Senator from one of the New England States [Mr. Hillhouse], in a speech delivered here on a bill for enforcing the Embargo, declared:—

"I feel myself bound in conscience to declare (lest the blood of those who shall fall in the execution of this measure shall be on my head) that I consider this to be an act which directs a mortal blow at the liberties of my country—an act containing unconstitutional provisions to which the people are not bound to submit, and to which, in my opinion, they will not submit."

And the Senator from Massachusetts himself, in a speech delivered on the same subject in the other House, said:—

"This opposition is constitutional and legal; it is also conscientious. It rests on settled and sober conviction that such policy is destructive to the interests of the people and dangerous to the being of government. The experience of every day confirms these sentiments. Men who act from such motives are not to be discouraged by trifling obstacles, nor awed by any dangers. They know the limit of constitutional opposition; up to that limit, at their own discretion, they will walk, and walk fearlessly."

How "the being of the Government" was to be endangered by "constitutional opposition" to the Embargo, I leave to the gentleman to explain.

Thus it will be seen, Mr. President, that the South Carolina doctrine is the Republican doctrine of 1798; that it was promulgated by the fathers of the faith; that it was maintained by Virginia and Kentucky in the worst of times; that it constituted the very pivot on which the political revolution of that day turned; that it embraces the very principles, the triumph of which at that time saved the Constitution at its last gasp, and which New England statesmen were not unwilling to adopt when they believed themselves to be the victims of unconstitutional legislation. Sir, as to the doctrine that the Federal Government is the exclusive judge of the extent as well as the limitations of its powers, it seems to me to be utterly subversive of the sovereignty and independence of the States. It makes but little difference, in

my estimation, whether Congress or the Supreme Court are invested with this power. If the Federal Government in all or any of its departments is to prescribe the limits of its own authority, and the States are bound to submit to the decision and are not to be allowed to examine and decide for themselves when the barriers of the Constitution shall be overleaped, this is practically "a government without limitation of powers." The States are at once reduced to mere petty corporations, and the people are entirely at your mercy. I have but one word more to add. In all the efforts that have been made by South Carolina to resist the unconstitutional laws which Congress has extended over them, she has kept steadily in view the preservation of the Union by the only means by which she believes it can be long preserved — a firm, manly, and steady resistance against usurpation. The measures of the Federal Government have, it is true, prostrated her interests, and will soon involve the whole South in irretrievable ruin. But even this evil, great as it is, is not the chief ground of our complaints. It is the principle involved in the contest — a principle, which, substituting the discretion of Congress for the limitations of the Constitution, brings the States and the people to the feet of the Federal Government, and leaves them nothing they can call their own. Sir, if the measures of the Federal Government were less oppressive, we should still strive against this usurpation. The South is acting on a principle she has always held sacred — resistance to unauthorized taxation. These, sir, are the principles which induced the immortal Hampden to resist the payment of a tax of twenty shillings. Would twenty shillings have ruined his fortune? No! but the payment of half twenty shillings, on the principle on which it was demanded, would have made him a slave. Sir, if in acting on these high motives — if animated by that ardent love of liberty which has always been the most prominent trait in the Southern character — we should be hurried beyond the bounds of a cold and calculating prudence, who is there with one noble and generous sentiment in his bosom that would not be disposed, in the language of Burke, to exclaim: "You must pardon something to the spirit of liberty!"

WILLIAM HAZLITT

(1778–1830)

HAZLITT'S lectures on English literature and other literary topics were among the earliest of those platform addresses by critics, scholars, scientists, and philosophers, for which the nineteenth century has been distinguished above all others in history. Hazlitt has been frequently attacked as a critic by other critics, who accuse him of «cramming for each occasion.» If that habit be more criminal than the habit much more general among critics of disregarding the facts they have not time or inclination to «cram,» the unquestionable and striking eloquence of Hazlitt's lectures has nevertheless immortalized them. The friend of Leigh Hunt, of Godwin, of Coleridge, and of Charles Lamb, he represents the intellectual tradition of a period in English literature which in many respects strikingly approximates the «Golden Age» of Elizabeth. Hazlitt was born April 10th, 1778, at Maidstone. His father was a Presbyterian clergyman, who sent him to the Unitarian College at Hackney to complete his education. It is said he received there the bent towards metaphysics which is so frequently apparent in his writings. In 1802 he determined to be a painter, and did finally open a studio in London, where he made a complete failure as an artist, and was accordingly forced into the field for which he was eminently fitted,—that of a lecturer and essayist on literature. His private life was irregular and unhappy. The nervous temperament which gave him the susceptibility necessary for the expression of his genius subjected him to constant depression as the price of his effectiveness, and he died, prematurely, September 18th, 1830, attended to the last by his friend Charles Lamb, who so strikingly resembled him in temperament.

ON WIT AND HUMOR

(From His Lectures on the English Comic Writers)

MAN is the only animal that laughs and weeps, for he is the only animal that is struck with the difference between what things are and what they ought to be. We weep at what thwarts or exceeds our desires in serious matters: we laugh

at what only disappoints our expectations in trifles. We shed tears from sympathy with real and necessary distress; as we burst into laughter from want of sympathy with that which is unreasonable and unnecessary, the absurdity of which provokes our spleen or mirth, rather than any serious reflections on it.

To explain the nature of laughter and tears is to account for the condition of human life, for it is in a manner compounded of these two. It is a tragedy or a comedy — sad or merry, as it happens. The crimes and misfortunes that are inseparable from it shock and wound the mind when they once seize upon it, and, when the pressure can no longer be borne, seek relief in tears; the follies and absurdities that men commit, or the odd accidents that befall them, afford us amusement from the very rejection of these false claims upon our sympathy, and end in laughter. If everything that went wrong, if every vanity or weakness in another gave us a sensible pang, it would be hard indeed; but as long as the disagreeableness of the consequences of a sudden disaster is kept out of sight by the immediate oddity of the circumstances, and the absurdity or unaccountableness of a foolish action is the most striking thing in it, the ludicrous prevails over the pathetic, and we receive pleasure instead of pain from the farce of life which is played before us, and which discomposes our gravity as often as it fails to move our anger or our pity.

. . . . . .

Mere wit, as opposed to reason or argument, consists in striking out some casual and partial coincidence which has nothing to do, or at least implies no necessary connection with the nature of the things, which are forced into a seeming analogy by a play upon words, or some irrelevant conceit, as in puns, riddles, alliteration, etc. The jest, in all such cases, lies in the sort of mock identity, or nominal resemblance, established by the intervention of the same words expressing different ideas, and countenancing, as it were, by a fatality of language, the mischievous insinuation which the person who has the wit to take advantage of it wishes to convey. So when the disaffected French wits applied to the new order of the *Fleur du lys* the *double entendre* of *Compagnons d'Ulysse*, or companions of Ulysses, meaning the animal into which the fellow-travelers of the Hero of the 'Odyssey' were transformed, this was a shrewd and biting intimation of a galling truth (if truth it were) by a fortuitous concourse of letters of the alphabet, jumping in "a foregone conclusion," but there was

no proof of the thing, unless it was self-evident. And, indeed, this may be considered as the best defense of the contested maxim, that ridicule is the test of truth; namely, that it does not contain or attempt a formal proof of it, but owes its power of conviction to the bare suggestion of it, so that if the thing when once hinted is not clear in itself, the satire fails of its effect and falls to the ground. The sarcasm here glanced at the character of the new or old French noblesse may not be well founded; but it is so like truth, and "comes in such a questionable shape," backed with the appearance of an identical proposition, that it would require a long train of facts and labored arguments to do away the impression, even if we were sure of the honesty and wisdom of the person who undertook to refute it. A flippant jest is as good a test of truth as a solid bribe; and there are serious sophistries,

"Soul-killing lies, and truths that work small good,"

as well as idle pleasantries. Of this we may be sure, that ridicule fastens on the vulnerable points of a cause, and finds out the weak sides of an argument; if those who resort to it sometimes rely too much on its success, those who are chiefly annoyed by it almost always are so with reason, and cannot be too much on their guard against deserving it. Before we can laugh at a thing, its absurdity must at least be open and palpable to common apprehension. Ridicule is necessarily built on certain supposed facts, whether true or false, and on their inconsistency with certain acknowledged maxims, whether right or wrong. It is, therefore, a fair test, if not a philosophical or abstract truth, at least of what is truth according to public opinion and common sense; for it can only expose to instantaneous contempt that which is condemned by public opinion, and is hostile to the common sense of mankind. Or, to put it differently, it is the test of the quantity of truth that there is in our favorite prejudices. To show how nearly allied wit is thought to be to truth, it is not unusual to say of any person: "Such a one is a man of sense; for though he said nothing, he laughed in the right place." Alliteration comes in here under the head of a certain sort of verbal wit; or, by pointing the expression, sometimes points the sense. Mr. Grattan's wit or eloquence (I don't know by what name to call it) would be nothing without this accompaniment.

Speaking of some ministers whom he did not like, he said: "Their only means of government are the guinea and the gallows." There can scarcely, it must be confessed, be a more effectual mode of political conversion than one of these applied to a man's friends, and the other to himself. The fine sarcasm of Junius on the effect of the supposed ingratitude of the Duke of Grafton at court, — "The instance might be painful but the principle would please," — notwithstanding the profound insight into human nature it implies, would hardly pass for wit without the alliteration, as some poetry would hardly be acknowledged as such without the rhyme to clench it. A quotation or a hackneyed phrase, dexterously turned or wrested to another purpose, has often the effect of the liveliest wit. An idle fellow who had only fourpence left in the world, which had been put by to pay for the baking some meat for his dinner, went and laid it out to buy a new string for a guitar. An old acquaintance, on hearing this story, repeated those lines out of the 'Allegro': —

"And ever against eating cares
Lap me in soft Lydian airs."

The reply of the author of the periodical paper called the World to a lady at church, who seeing him look thoughtful, asked what he was thinking of — "The next World" — is a perversion of an established formula of language, something of the same kind. Rhymes are sometimes a species of wit, where there is an alternate combination and resolution or decomposition of the elements of sound, contrary to our usual division and classification of them in ordinary speech, not unlike the sudden separation and reunion of the component parts of the machinery in a pantomime. The author who excels infinitely the most in this way is the writer of 'Hudibras.' He also excels in the invention of single words and names, which have the effect of wit by sounding big, and meaning nothing — "full of sound and fury, signifying nothing." But of the artifices of this author's burlesque style I shall have occasion to speak hereafter. It is not always easy to distinguish between the wit of words and that of things, "for thin partitions do their bounds divide." Some of the late Mr. Curran's *bon mots*, or *jeux d'esprit*, might be said to owe their birth to this sort of equivocal generation; or were a happy mixture of verbal wit and a lively and picturesque fancy, of legal acuteness in detecting the variable applications of words, and of a mind apt at perceiving

the ludicrous in external objects. "Do you see anything ridiculous in this wig?" said one of his brother judges to him. "Nothing but the head," was the answer. Now here instantaneous advantage was taken of the slight technical ambiguity in the construction of language, and the matter-of-fact is flung into the scale as a thumping makeweight. After all, verbal and accidental strokes of wit, though the most surprising and laughable, are not the best and most lasting. That wit is the most refined and effectual which is founded on the detection of unexpected likeness or distinction in things, rather than in words. It is more severe and galling, that is, it is more unpardonable though less surprising, in proportion as the thought suggested is more complete and satisfactory, from its being inherent in the nature of the things themselves. *Hæret lateri lethalis arundo.* Truth makes the greatest libel, and it is that which barbs the darts of wit. The Duke of Buckingham's saying, "Laws are not, like women, the worse for being old," is an instance of a harmless truism and the utmost malice of wit united. This is, perhaps, what has been meant by the distinction between true and false wit. Mr. Addison, indeed, goes so far as to make it the exclusive test of true wit that it will bear translation into another language, that is to say, that it does not depend at all on the form of expression. But this is by no means the case. Swift would hardly have allowed of such a strait-laced theory, to make havoc with his darling conundrums; though there is no one whose serious wit is more that of things, as opposed to a mere play either of words or fancy. I ought, I believe, to have noticed before, in speaking of the difference between wit and humor, that wit is often pretended absurdity, where the person overacts or exaggerates a certain part with a conscious design to expose it as if it were another person, as when Mandrake in the 'Twin Rivals' says: "This glass is too big, carry it away; I'll drink out of the bottle." On the contrary, when Sir Hugh Evans says very innocently, "'Od's plessed will, I will not be absent at the grace," though there is here a great deal of humor, there is no wit. This kind of wit of the humorist, where the person makes a butt of himself, and exhibits his own absurdities or foibles purposely in the most pointed and glaring lights, runs through the whole of the character of Falstaff, and is, in truth, the principle on which it is founded. It is an irony directed against oneself. Wit is, in fact, a voluntary act of the mind, or exercise of the invention, showing the

absurd and ludicrous consciously, whether in ourselves or another Cross-readings, where the blunders are designed, are wit; but if any one were to light upon them through ignorance or accident, they would be merely ludicrous.

It might be made an argument of the intrinsic superiority of poetry or imagination to wit, that the former does not admit of mere verbal combinations. Whenever they do occur, they are uniformly blemishes. It requires something more solid and substantial to raise admiration or passion. The general forms and aggregate masses of our ideas must be brought more into play, to give weight and magnitude. Imagination may be said to be the finding out something similar in things generally alike, or with like feelings attached to them, while wit principally aims at finding out something that seems the same, or amounts to a momentary deception where you least expected it, namely, in things totally opposite. The reason why more slight and partial, or merely accidental and nominal, resemblances serve the purposes of wit, and indeed characterize its essence as a distinct operation and faculty of the mind, is, that the object of ludicrous poetry is naturally to let down and lessen; and it is easier to let down than to raise up; to weaken than to strengthen; to disconnect our sympathy from passion and power than to attach and rivet it to any object of grandeur or interest; to startle and shock our preconceptions, by incongruous and equivocal combinations, than to confirm, enforce, and expand them by powerful and lasting associations of ideas, or striking and true analogies. A slight cause is sufficient to produce a slight effect. To be indifferent or skeptical requires no effort; to be enthusiastic and in earnest requires a strong impulse and collective power. Wit and humor (comparatively speaking, or taking the extremes to judge of the gradations by) appeal to our indolence, our vanity, our weakness, and insensibility; serious and impassioned poetry appeals to our strength, our magnanimity, our virtue, and humanity. Anything is sufficient to heap contempt upon an object; even the bare suggestion of a mischievous allusion to what is improper dissolves the whole charm and puts an end to our admiration of the sublime or beautiful. Reading the finest passage in Milton's 'Paradise Lost' in a false tone will make it seem insipid and absurd. The cavilling at, or invidiously pointing out, a few slips of the pen will embitter the pleasure or alter our opinion of a whole work, and make us throw it down in disgust. The critics

are aware of this vice and infirmity in our nature, and play upon it with periodical success. The meanest weapons are strong enough for this kind of warfare, and the meanest hands can wield them. Spleen can subsist on any kind of food. The shadow of a doubt, the hint of an inconsistency, a word, a look, a syllable, will destroy our best-formed convictions. What puts this argument in as striking a point of view as anything is the nature of parody or burlesque, the secret of which lies merely in transposing or applying at a venture to anything, or to the lowest objects, that which is applicable only to certain given things, or to the highest matters. "From the sublime to the ridiculous, there is but one step." The slightest want of unity of impression destroys the sublime; the detection of the smallest incongruity is an infallible ground to rest the ludicrous upon.

FREDERICK KARL FRANZ HECKER

(1811–1881)

THE German Revolution of 1848 was the greatest event of the nineteenth century for continental Europe. It checked the Reactionists of France, and forced parliamentary government, not only on Germany, but on every other country of continental Europe, except Russia and Turkey. Seeming to end in failure, with its leaders in flight for their lives, it was really one of the great triumphs of the civilized intellect against the mediæval. Its permanent moral success was due to the work of a few dauntless young Germans, scholars and thinkers, with Frederick Hecker as one of the most dauntless among them. He was born at Eichtersheim in Baden, September 28th, 1811. After graduating in law at Heidelberg, he began practicing his profession in the supreme court at Manheim. His great eloquence led to his election to the second chamber in Baden, and his liberal sympathies soon brought him into close relations with the opponents of German absolutism — notably with the Turner societies, in which opposition to despotic government had taken a strong hold. After the failure of the Revolution of 1848 and the defeat at Kaudern (April 20th, 1849), he escaped to Basel where for some time he edited a progressive newspaper. Finding the Reactionists too strong for him, he joined the thousands of young German Liberals who were emigrating to the United States. Settling in Illinois, not far from St. Louis, he passed the remainder of his useful life in America, serving as a Colonel in the Civil War and dying in 1881. His speeches and lectures, which are published in German by C. Witter, of St. Louis, are examples of most extraordinary eloquence. When they are better known in Germany,— as they are likely to be before the close of the twentieth century,— they will go far to establish Colonel Hecker's reputation as one of the most eloquent men who ever spoke the German language.

LIBERTY IN THE NEW ATLANTIS

(An Oration Delivered on July 4th, 1871, at Trenton, Ill. Translated by Permission from 'Reden and Forlesungen' by Frederick Hecker, C. Witter, St. Louis)

My Friends:—

THE roar of war in the Old World has died away; the shout of victory grows less noisy; graves sink in, blood-pools are washed away, and hard by the ruins of palaces and hovels sit Misery and Heartache and Want, while we hallow the birthday of this great free nation, celebrate the independence of this Atlantis from the power of princes and the yoke of kings, and consecrate this banner, the symbol of the courage of manhood and the love of liberty!

Independence! a grand word! whose full enjoyment none of woman born can share! And he can hold himself most fortunate, when the greatest measure of dependency has been lifted from his shoulders!

Independence and Liberty are an inseparable pair of sisters. Only he who is independent is free, and the freeman alone is independent!

And this is the higher purpose of genuine Turn-craft—to develop the body and to deliver it from weakness and ailments; to free the intellect from all shackles; with "the wing-stroke of a free mind to disperse the spectres of ignorance, of superstition, of irrestraint, and the spirit of servility! With uplifted banner, with body and with mind to strive towards independence and liberty!" As in the ever-memorable era of 1848–49, the Turners, rank on rank, clear in their might of manhood, stood first in freedom's camp, so here, likewise, they were among the first who battled against oligarchy; who with their bodies defended the unity, the equality, the liberty, the union of this land; who bled for them and joyously marched to their death for them. And as the Turners have ever held it a duty to fight in the front rank for manhood rights and human freedom, so they will fall back from their place and from their flag, emblem of their principles, only when they are carried back—dead!

The Republican form of government is the arch of triumph that leads to the realization of our high ideal! The Republic,

because it has for its foundation liberty and equality,—because it gives the individual man time and room for free, untrammeled development,—is the highway that leads to the temple of true human dignity. And on this holiday, it becomes us to glance around us and to look upon the picture which the Age unrolls before us!

Two nations celebrate their independence this year. We celebrate here our independence from king-craft, from our parent stock beyond the waters, and from oppression which other nationalities exercised over their spontaneity, their individuality, their power, their development!

Germany is no longer obliged now to receive as tantamount to orders the wishes of a Czar and his Nesselrode, or to put up with the culture and civilization dictated by a ruler of Pandours, Croats, Slovaks, and the like, with his Metternich! No longer has she to submit to the trade ordinances of the oligarchical monarchic shopkeepers of Great Britain, with her Castlereaghs, Wellingtons, and Russells! No longer has she to be on the watch for the crowing of the Gallic cock, for the prey-scream of the eagle, or the fanfaronades of Gaul!

Germany has seized and holds her future in her own strong hand. And as she fought for her national independence against the outside, so on the inside may she conquer independence for the individual citizen, celebrating solemnly, as we do each year, the day of a Magna Charta, and not merely a peace sealed with the pommel of the sword. Treaties of peace are short of breath and short-lived! Free constitutions endure from generation to generation!

On the day on which ninety-five years ago the American people declared their independence and in doing so announced and spread before the whole world the gospel of the people—from that ever-memorable day on, the wages of the trade of royalty steadily fell! Yes, Kingship got to be, as to-day in Spain, knocked down to the lowest bidder, and this great Continent, which almost reaches from pole to pole—this Atlantis, with legends of which Egyptian priests had filled the minds of Solon and of Plato—this our sea-born Atlantis is destined to rejuvenate the world into Liberty! And on the birthday of the American Republic it becomes us well to consider the effect of that solemn act of the Declaration of Independence and to draw comparisons of the conditions of the other nations.

At that time this country had a population of two million eight hundred thousand inhabitants. This immense territory was a wilderness, a home for wild beasts and wilder savages. To-day the people number close to forty millions, and before the St. Sylvester night of 1899, when the nineteenth century is rung out and the twentieth is rung in, there will be from eighty million to one hundred million Republicans here to celebrate the day! A shiver creeps along the backbone of Kingcraft and its servitors at the thought!

A hundred millions of Republicans — a fearful propaganda! "O my exalted, imperial master! What is to become of us?" stutter the lackeys. With a shrill scream, like a new Phœnix, arisen from brass-slack and ashes, rushes the locomotive through what lately was wilderness, away over hill and abyss, dale and waters, chasm and plain, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It is bannered with the Stars and Stripes, and the piercing sound that echoes from its waving folds strikes my ear: "Free, free, free!" On all the seas floats this respect-compelling symbol of free citizenship! On stream and ocean, on a thousand highways, by land-roads, sea-roads, and railroads, there is a rush and activity like that of ants or honeybees; and further, ever further, the country opens its lap and shakes therefrom the riches of the earth! Here only those beg who will beg. And this country is not directed by kings and high-born gentlemen; not protected by mighty standing armies, not governed by a well-clothed and trained body of officials. It is not governed from "on High!" Possibly it is not governed at all! It dispenses with the entire happiness-bestowing paraphernalia of European nations, and still it grows, extends itself, and prospers. In amazement the nations view this resurrected Atlantis and ask: Who has done all this? Who is the necromancer?

It is the Liberty, it is the Independence, which deprives no human being of his opportunity for development and activity!

With a contemptuous shrug of the shoulders, the children of antiquated, over-refined, and almost stereotyped culture may gaze on the man from the great Western Continent, and on his rough, often unpolished manners, and point their fingers to outbursts of uncouthness and unrestraint here and there. Where man dwells, there dwell also men's passions. The difference between here and there is only in this: Here passion rages publicly, seen by the world's eyes. There a veil is spread over the corruption of so-

ciety. The common people of New York, even when not regarded as a present from the Old World, are not worse, are not more abominable, than the populace of Europe's great centres of humanity. For all that and all this, "we sovereign members of a sovereign people" prefer to move and have our being here under the Stars and Stripes rather than under any tricolor of royal might and splendor of monarchical ordination and subordination.

No doubt there are some few, who, having scraped a sufficiency of mammon together, have returned to the Old World, and there have scattered broadcast their condemnation of this country and its people, telling how differently they feel among polished gentlemen, beautiful women, and the fine lace ruffles of the court under the protection of Imperial Majesty and the royal police. But be it said as a subject for your consolation, my friends, that those, who, to the great joy of every European beadle and beggar-catcher and of his lord and master, thus cast their potsherd ballot of condemnation, of ostracism against the Republic, consist only of three kinds:—

Either they are of the kind who stand in admiration before their own greatness and distinction; who recoil before our West, because kid gloves are still so scarce and our unrestrained manners are still so unsmooth and roughly welted; who, in fine, have stuck in the seacoast cities of the East, because there it is a little more like Europe, but principally because there it is easier to pile up money! Their greatness was not a source of wonder! They felt themselves banished, turned back! They took a short look at the Union through New York Paddy, Tammany spectacles, and crawfished back to their mothers! Or, they are those over whom the shell of European customs, *convenance*, and social formations had grown as tightly as if they were crabs, and consequently they had it always in mind to return — as soon as they had made friends with the Almighty Dollar. The third on this and on the other side of the ocean consists of disappointed ne'er-do-wells, enthused by the hope of the greatest possible amount of enjoyment and, if possible, of no work at all. Members of the first two classes take pains, however, to invest the savings they have scraped together in American securities. For that object, the Republic is good enough for them.

We will not be broken-hearted, seeing them go back whence they came. They may feel happier among house servants and court lackeys than in our company, and may hurrah in front of

the statue of Frederick Wilhelm III., which significantly was unveiled on the day on which the people in arms celebrated the victory they had won,—the statue of that Frederick Wilhelm III., who persecuted Turnerdom, who organized the "crusade against demagogues," who with press, speech, association meetings, and other gags and clubs, declared war on every liberal idea, and at whose death the entire German nation breathed freer as if it were released from a nightmare.

One thing more we will shout at those tired of America. "You have taken your seat between two stools! Those abroad regard you suspiciously as not belonging to their class, while we over here will have nothing to do with you! March! Off with you!"

That this nation has steadily grown in power, has exhibited its assets to all the people of the universe; that notwithstanding many shortcomings in administration and policy, which, alas! are inseparable from human nature, it has steadily prospered; that of all the countries of the world, except England, it is the only one which has decreased its national debt, while others have suffered deficit after deficit, asked for loan after loan, accumulating a truly wonderful garland of I. O. U.'s—what a spectacle that contrast makes for those beyond the Atlantic Ocean!

A cry of horror and indignation is set up on account of cruelties, bloodshed, murder, and incendiarism perpetrated by dehumanized, hell-crazed people in Paris! It is a shriek against the incarnate red spectre, still as of old a threatening of all existing things, all order, the entire social fabric of the present!

"This," they say, "is the result of your teachings of the freedom and the equality of man, of human dignity and of human rights!" "There you are with your Republic!" howls the whole horde of reaction. The court chamberlains are hanging on all the fire-alarm bells; the lackeys high and low are ringing the tocsin against freedom, and trailing on royal tricolor poles their *lettres de cachet* against the Republic and Republicanism throughout the world, from Petersburg to Madrid. What a vulture feast they are preparing as they get ready to rend the flesh of the Prometheus of Liberty!

Who, I ask of you, ye rulers and quaking knaves,—who is it that forced the growth of all these horrors and hideous crimes, of all this scoundrelism and debauchery? Was it not thou, Ape of Octavianus, who with word and letter played the Socialist?

Then these rascals and swindlers, these Mires, Mornies, Pereires, and Maganys, these Jeckers and St. Arnands,—the entire circumcised and uncircumcised lot,—who was it cultivated, preferred, distinguished, selected, and raised them to the dignities of representatives of Cæsarism? Was it not you who fostered rivalry and extravagance, parade, and fashion, and folly, hiding under high-sounding names whatever was worst and most corrupt, as we know from Plutarch and Tacitus was once done by your likes in the decadence of Athens and Rome? Harlots became "demimonde"; swindles passed as "institutes of credit"; murder and deportation were called "the salvation of order"; vice was courtier like, and for all this they are praised as the "saviors of society"—these hangmen of reaction!

Did not the great ones of earth become his guests and bend the hinges of their knees before the doubtful reputation of his wife? Did they not recline upon his pillows, and banquet and gorge themselves? And at the World Exposition, and there where the gray monuments of the despotic Pharaohs cast their gaze towards the Suez Canal—there stood the neglected, hard-working, hungry people where they could see the Cocotte, the Cancan covered with gold and diamonds, and official thieves in brilliant equipages and embroidered uniforms! They saw the feast of Belshazzer and the lustful splendor of the woman of the Apocalypse.

"Am I not better than Cora Pearl, the Boulanger, the Schneider? Mine and my mother's past are not Montijo's," said the pale wife of the proletarian. "Do I not earn my scant bread in the sweat of my brow?" grumbled the workman in his blouse, as the protected gamblers of the Stock Exchange and the grand-larcenists of wealth in their well-fed splendor drove in a whirl past them.

When you have cut the foundation of morals from under the feet of the people, you accuse liberty and human rights of the crime, ye true sons of Lucifer! But believe not, my friends, that these conditions are alone centred in Paris and France!

The cancer of the age does its foul work in all the great hells of humanity—in London and Vienna, in Petersburg and Berlin, in Rome and Madrid, in every place where are collected those who for easy gain, higher enjoyment, and greater wealth await opportunities for anything, no matter what; or, fearing the light, are obliged to hide in the labyrinth of the sea of houses, where

myriad funguses molder before one plant takes healthy root; where the sediment and ferment of misery-stricken human nature seek to leave their deposit!

It is the cancer of a richly inventive, exaggerated, indispensable industrialism which devours small industries as Saturn did his children. It is an age which has produced ephemeral millionaires, and millions of envious workingmen filled with the darts of hate. Nineveh and Babylon, Sodom and Gomorrah, Antioch and Byzantium? Who is it that will dissolve this strange enchantment, and read this riddle of the Sphinx?

But the more a legion of officials and soldiers, of nobles and princes, representing unproductive activity, call upon the productive activity of the people to uphold the old society and its forms, the faster the maintenance of that order will undermine order itself.

The ship drives into the rapids! Faster and faster! Downwards, downwards! into the foaming waters! into the chasm's abyss!

As yet, danger to this country is not near, where the greater part of the land is still waiting for millions and millions of hands to bring its treasure to light. But already inherited cancerous ulcers of corruption — money-monarchies and bandit-associations of powerful monopolies make themselves felt among our public servants!

But into our hands, into our sovereign hands, has it been given to use the surgeon's knife and the cauterizing iron. At the hour when the people will it, will these faithless thieves be scourged at the pillory, these monopolies annihilated, these plunderer-bands be dispersed! The whole people, the State, will step into the place of the monopolists! Already our new Constitution in Illinois has taken the first step, and we make acknowledgment to the most irreproachable of the governors of Illinois, J. M. Palmer, for his intervention.

In conclusion, let me call up before you a vision, a dream. Heavy night lay over the earth and sky; the sea was dark, filled with high, black waves, and a proud woman in golden armor, the standard of the Republic undulating in her hand, led me up to a high sea-beaten cliff, that in the ocean afar overtopped the hills of earth! When she raised her hand towards the East, a thousand lights from the Aurora Borealis blazed forth; and like a fire-lit picture before me the Old World lay! In trumpet tones

sounded a mighty voice: I am the destiny of the Old World, I am America, and I will plant the banner of the deliverance of humanity on every land! See, I have taken away hunger from the lands of the East! I have given them the potato and the golden ear of maize! I have healed their fever-shaken bodies with the bark of the cinchona; with balm of healing herbs I have restored their bodies, and with the aroma of tobacco I have beguiled their cares. With woods for dyes, for use, for ornament, I have adorned their houses and completed and furnished their ships. The steamer, the tamed leviathan, and the lightning's writing are my work, and from seashore to seashore my sons have laid iron strands until they have encircled the globe. Against my shores the Gulf Stream breaks its force and hastens on to warm the farthest northland of Europe. In the Florida gulf invisibly and silently the coral billions are at work to turn the Gulf Stream and to cover Europe with ice, but my genius will remove this barrier. The iron-cuirassed ship and the ram of bronze and the monitor are the children of my brain; and I have taught the laws of the Trade Winds, and I pour out the treasures of the depths of the sea and the land for my people, that it may be multiplied and nourished, while to protect it I hold over it and its future this bright banner of the Stars and Stripes,—an emblem of freedom and human dignity for all,—that beneath it shall be a rendezvous for the free of the earth! And in this sign, I will conquer!

HERMANN LUDWIG FERDINAND VON HELMHOLTZ

(1821–1894)

THE scientific imagination was never so daring as in the nineteenth century, nor was its daring ever more strikingly illustrated than in the theory of the correlation of forces and the conservation of energy, so eloquently presented by Helmholtz in his Heidelberg address of 1871. The sublimity of its peroration has hardly been surpassed. His comparison of the vital principle to flame, and to a musical chord which is no sooner struck than it becomes an entity other than and above the material agency producing it, would hardly have been possible for any one but a German scientist, representing the highest scientific and æsthetic culture of his country.

He was born at Potsdam, August 31st, 1821, and in 1843 began his professional career as military physician in that city. From 1849 when he became Professor of Physiology at Königsberg until his death, September 8th, 1894, he increased in intellectual power and in reputation. He held professorships at Bonn, Heidelberg, and Berlin, invented the ophthalmoscope, wrote 'The Theory of the Conservation of Force,' 'The Doctrine of Tone-Generation,' and other era-making works, and made discoveries in acoustics and optics which attracted the attention of the scientific world. No one who reads 'The Mystery of Creation,' here given from his Heidelberg addresses of 1871, will need to be told that he had an intellect of the highest order.

THE MYSTERY OF CREATION

(From an Address Delivered at Heidelberg in 1871)

ALL life and all motion on our earth is, with few exceptions, kept up by a single force, that of the sun's rays, which bring to us light and heat. They warm the air of the hot zones; this becomes lighter and ascends, while the colder air flows toward the poles. Thus is formed the great circulation of the passage-winds. Local differences of temperature over land and sea, plains and mountains, disturb the uniformity of this great motion, and produce for us the capricious change of winds.

Warm aqueous vapors ascend with the warm air, become condensed into clouds, and fall in the cooler zones, and upon the snowy tops of the mountains, as rain and as snow. The water collects in brooks, in rivers, moistens the plains, and makes life possible; crumbles the stones, carries their fragments along, and thus works at the geological transformation of the earth's surface. It is only under the influence of the sun's rays that the variegated covering of plants of the earth grows; and while they grow, they accumulate in their structure organic matter, which partly serves the whole animal kingdom as food, and serves man more particularly as fuel. Coals and lignites, the sources of power of our steam engines, are remains of primitive plants, the ancient production of the sun's rays.

Need we wonder if, to our forefathers of the Aryan race in India and Persia, the sun appeared as the fittest symbol of the Deity? They were right in regarding it as the giver of all life —as the ultimate source of almost all that has happened on earth.

But whence does the sun acquire this force? It radiates forth a more intense light than can be attained with any terrestrial means. It yields as much heat as if fifteen hundred pounds of coal were burned every hour upon each square foot of its surface. Of the heat which thus issues from it, the small fraction which enters our atmosphere furnishes a great mechanical force. Every steam engine teaches us that heat can produce such force. The sun, in fact, drives on earth a kind of steam engine whose performances are far greater than those of artificially constructed machines. The circulation of water in the atmosphere raises, as has been said, the water evaporated from the warm tropical seas to the mountain heights; it is, as it were, a water-raising engine of the most magnificent kind, with whose power no artificial machine can be even distantly compared. I have previously explained the mechanical equivalent of heat. Calculated by that standard, the work which the sun produces by its radiation is equal to the constant exertion of seven thousand horse power for each square foot of the sun's surface.

For a long time experience had impressed on our mechanicians that a working force cannot be produced from nothing; that it can only be taken from the stores which nature possesses, which are strictly limited, and which cannot be increased at pleasure—whether it be taken from the rushing water or from

the wind; whether from the layers of coal, or from men and from animals, which cannot work without the consumption of food. Modern physics has attempted to prove the universality of this experience, to show that it applies to the great whole of all natural processes, and is independent of the special interests of man These have been generalized and comprehended in the all-ruling natural law of the conservation of force. No natural process, and no series of natural processes, can be found, however manifold may be the changes which take place among them, by which a motive force can be continuously produced, without a corresponding consumption. Just as the human race finds on earth but a limited supply of motive forces, capable of producing work, which it can utilize but not increase, so also must this be the case in the great whole of nature. The universe has its definite store of force, which works in it under ever-varying forms; is indestructible, not to be increased, everlasting and unchangeable like matter itself. It seems as if Goethe has an idea of this when he makes the earth-spirit speak of himself as the representative of natural force: —

«In the currents of life, in the tempests of motion,
In the fervor of art, in the fire, in the storm,
Hither and thither,
Over and under,
Wend I and wander.
Birth and the grave,
Limitless ocean,
Where the restless wave
Undulates ever
Under and over,
Their seething strife
Heaving and weaving
The changes of life.
At the whirling loom of time unawed,
I work the living mantle of God.»

Let us return to the special question which concerns us here: Whence does the sun derive this enormous store of force which it sends out?

On earth the processes of combustion are the most abundant source of heat. Does the sun's heat originate in a process of this kind? To this question we can reply with a complete and decided negative, for we now know that the sun contains the

terrestrial elements with which we are acquainted. Let us select from among them the two, which, for the smallest mass, produce the greatest amount of heat when they combine; let us assume that the sun consists of hydrogen and oxygen, mixed in the proportion in which they would unite to form water. The mass of the sun is known, and also the quantity of heat produced by the union of known weights of oxygen and hydrogen. Calculation shows that under the above supposition the heat resulting from their combustion would be sufficient to keep up the radiation of heat from the sun for three thousand and twenty-one years. That, it is true, is a long time, but even profane history teaches that the sun has lighted and warmed us for three thousand years, and geology puts it beyond doubt that this period must be extended to millions of years.

Known chemical forces are thus so completely inadequate, even on the most favorable assumption, to explain the production of heat which takes place in the sun, that we must quite drop this hypothesis.

We must seek for forces of far greater magnitude, and these we can only find in cosmical attraction. We have already seen that the comparatively small masses of shooting stars and meteorites can produce extraordinarily large amounts of heat when their cosmical velocities are arrested by our atmosphere. Now, the force which has produced these great velocities is gravitation. We know of this force as one acting on the surface of our planet when it appears as terrestrial gravity. We know that a weight raised from the earth can drive our clocks, and that in like manner the gravity of the water rushing down from the mountains works our mills.

If a weight fall from a height and strike the ground, its mass loses, indeed, the visible motion which it had as a whole — in fact, however, this motion is not lost; it is transferred to the smallest elementary particles of the mass, and this invisible vibration of the molecules is the motion of heat. Visible motion is transformed by impact into the motion of heat.

That which holds in this respect for gravity holds also for gravitation. A heavy mass, of whatever kind, which is suspended in space separated from another heavy mass, represents a force capable of work. For both masses attract each other, and, if unrestrained by centrifugal force, they move toward each other under the influence of this attraction; this takes place with ever-

increasing velocity; and if this velocity is finally destroyed, whether this be suddenly by collision, or gradually by the friction of movable parts, it develops the corresponding quantity of the motion of heat, the amount of which can be calculated from the equivalence, previously established, between heat and mechanical work.

Now we may assume with great probability that very many more meteors fall upon the sun than upon the earth, and with greater velocity, too, and therefore give more heat. Yet the hypothesis that the entire amount of the sun's heat which is continually lost by radiation is made up by the fall of meteors, a hypothesis which was propounded by Mayer, and has been favorably adopted by several other physicists, is open, according to Sir W. Thomson's investigations, to objection; for, assuming it to hold, the mass of the sun should increase so rapidly that the consequences would have shown themselves in the accelerated motion of the planets. The entire loss of heat from the sun cannot at all events be produced in this way; at the most a portion, which, however, may not be inconsiderable.

If, now, there is no present manifestation of force sufficient to cover the expenditure of the sun's heat, the sun must originally have had a store of heat which it gradually gives out. But whence this store? We know that the cosmical forces alone could have produced it. And here the hypothesis, previously discussed as to the origin of the sun, comes to our aid. If the mass of the sun had been once diffused in cosmical space, and had then been condensed,—that is, had fallen together under the influence of celestial gravity,—if then the resultant motion had been destroyed by friction and impact with the production of heat, the new world produced by such condensation must have acquired a store of heat, not only of considerable, but even of colossal magnitude.

Calculation shows that, assuming the thermal capacity of the sun to be the same as that of water, the temperature might be raised to twenty-eight million of degrees, if this quantity of heat could ever have been present in the sun at one time. This cannot be assumed, for such an increase of temperature would offer the greatest hindrance to condensation. It is probable rather that a great part of this heat which was produced by condensation began to radiate into space before this condensation was complete. But the heat which the sun could have previously devel-

oped by its condensation would have been sufficient to cover its present expenditure for not less than twenty-two million years of the past.

And the sun is by no means so dense as it may become. Spectrum analysis demonstrates the presence of large masses of iron and of other known constituents of the rocks. The pressure which endeavors to condense the interior is about eight hundred times as great as that in the centre of the earth; and yet the density of the sun, owing probably to its enormous temperature, is less than a quarter of the mean density of the earth.

We may therefore assume with great probability that the sun will still continue in its condensation, even if it only attained the density of the earth — though it will probably become far denser in the interior, owing to the enormous pressure — this would develop fresh quantities of heat which would be sufficient to maintain for an additional seventeen million years the same intensity of sunshine as that which is now the source of all terrestrial life.

. . . . . .

The term of seventeen million years which I have given may, perhaps, become considerably prolonged by the gradual abatement of radiation, by the new accretion of falling meteors, and by still greater condensation than that which I have assumed in that calculation. But we know of no natural process which could spare our sun the fate which has manifestly fallen upon other suns. This is a thought which we only reluctantly admit; it seems to us an insult to the beneficent Creative Power which we otherwise find at work in organisms, and especially in living ones. But we must reconcile ourselves to the thought that, however we may consider ourselves to be the centre and final object of creation, we are but as dust on the earth; which again is but a speck of dust in the immensity of space; and the previous duration of our race, even if we follow it far beyond our written history, into the era of the lake dwellings or of the mammoth, is but an instant compared with the primeval times of our planet, when living beings existed upon it, whose strange and unearthly remains still gaze at us from their ancient tombs; and far more does the duration of our race sink into insignificance compared with the enormous periods during which worlds have been in process of formation, and will still continue to form when our sun is extinguished, and our earth is either solidified in cold, or is united with the ignited central body of our system.

But who knows whether the first living inhabitants of the warm sea on the young world, whom we ought perhaps to honor as our ancestors, would not have regarded our present cooler condition with as much horror as we look on a world without a sun? Considering the wonderful adaptability to the conditions of life which all organisms possess, who knows to what degree of perfection our posterity will have been developed in seventeen million years, and whether our fossilized bones will not perhaps seem to them as monstrous as those of the Ichthyosaurus now do; and whether they, adjusted for a more sensitive state of equilibrium, will not consider the extremes of temperature, within which we now exist, to be just as violent and destructive as those of the older geological times appear to us? Yea, even if sun and earth should solidify and become motionless, who could say what new worlds would not be ready to develop life? Meteoric stones sometimes contain hydrocarbons; the light of the heads of comets exhibits a spectrum which is most like that of the electrical light in gases containing hydrogen and carbon. But carbon is the element, which is characteristic of organic compounds, from which living bodies are built up. Who knows whether these bodies, which everywhere swarm through space, do not scatter germs of life wherever there is a new world, which has become capable of giving a dwelling-place to organic bodies. And this life we might perhaps consider as allied to ours in its primitive germ, however different might be the form which it would assume in adapting itself to its new dwelling-place.

However this may be, that which most arouses our moral feelings at the thought of a future, though possibly very remote, cessation of all living creation on the earth is more particularly the question whether all this life is not an aimless sport, which will ultimately fall a prey to destruction by brute force. Under the light of Darwin's great thought, we begin to see that, not only pleasure and joy, but also pain, struggle, and death, are the powerful means by which Nature has built up her finer and more perfect forms of life. And we men know more particularly that in our intelligence, our civic order, and our morality we are living on the inheritance which our forefathers have gained for us, and that which we acquire in the same way will, in like manner, ennoble the life of our posterity. Thus the individual, who works for the ideal objects of humanity, even if in a modest position, and in a limited sphere of activity, may bear without fear the thought that the thread of his own consciousness will one day

break. But even men of such free and large order of minds as Lessing and David Strauss could not reconcile themselves to the thought of a final destruction of the living race, and with it of all the fruits of all past generations.

As yet we know of no fact, which can be established by scientific observation, which would show that the finer and complex forms of vital motion could exist otherwise than in the dense material of organic life; that it can propagate itself as the sound-movement of a string can leave its originally narrow and fixed home and diffuse itself in the air, keeping all the time its pitch, and the most delicate shade of its color-tint; and that, when it meets another string attuned to it, starts this again or excites a flame ready to sing to the same tone. The flame even, which of all processes in inanimate nature is the closest type of life, may become extinct, but the heat which it produces continues to exist — indestructible, imperishable, as an invisible motion, now agitating the molecules of ponderable matter, and then radiating into boundless space as the vibration of an ether. Even there it retains the characteristic peculiarities of its origin, and it reveals its history to the inquirer who questions it by the spectroscope. United afresh, these rays may ignite a new flame, and thus, as it were, acquire a new bodily existence.

Just as the flame remains the same in appearance, and continues to exist with the same form and structure, although it draws every minute fresh combustible vapor, and fresh oxygen from the air, into the vortex of its ascending current; and just as the wave goes on in unaltered form, and is yet being reconstructed every moment from fresh particles of water, so also in the living being it is not the definite mass of substance which now constitutes the body, to which the continuance of the individual is attached. For the material of the body, like that of the flame, is subject to continuous and comparatively rapid change — a change the more rapid the livelier the activity of the organs in question. Some constituents are renewed from day to day, some from month to month, and others only after years. That which continues to exist as a particular individual is like the flame and the wave — only the form of motion which continually attracts fresh matter into its vortex and expels the old. The observer with a deaf ear only recognizes the vibration of sound as long as it is visible and can be felt, bound up with heavy matter. Are our senses, in reference to life, like the deaf ear in this respect?

PATRICK HENRY

(1736–1799)

THE first great orator produced by the American spirit of resistance to arbitrary power, Patrick Henry, has had a narrow escape from Bolingbroke's fate of surviving in a reputation for great eloquence rather than in the authentic text of his really representative orations. The speech which made him his first reputation, forced him into leadership, and did so much to force issues with England, is not reported at all. It was delivered in the "Parson's Cause" of 1763 against the claims of the church establishment in Virginia to use the taxing power of the State. From it dates church disestablishment in America — a charge almost as great as the Union of Church and State under Constantine. His next great speech, 'Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death,' delivered in the Virginia Convention of March 1775, is represented by a version which has become an American classic. It has Wirt as authority for its accuracy. But from this time until 1788, when he poured out a flood of vehement argument against the adoption of the Federal Constitution, Henry is practically unreported. This is due, in a large part, to his great power as an orator. He is one of the very few men in history so quick in apprehension, and so prompt in expression, as to be really capable at all times of speaking extemporaneously and at the same time with their own greatest possibilities of effectiveness. Most men — most even of those who deserve to be called great orators — have had the gift of fluent delivery only as an incident of ability to prepare themselves in advance by severe and connected thought — an ability which is rarer even than that of eloquence. That a man on the spur of the moment should speak as logically, as consistently, as effectively as most men of great intellect can only after preparation, is so extraordinary that it would be incredible if men like Patrick Henry had not lived to demonstrate it. Such eloquence has in it something of the force of the primitive "Rhapsodists," the unlettered poets and prophets whose extemporaneous outbursts of higher intelligence forced its first civilization on Europe.

Patrick Henry was born May 29th, 1736, in Hanover County, Virginia. He was the son of John Henry, a Scotchman of the humblest class, and it was not until after he had achieved his great success as an orator that he became identified with the landholding element

which then governed Virginia. When at the age of twenty-four he applied for admission to the bar, he had failed in several previous attempts to make a start in life, and it is said that his knowledge of law was derived from a six weeks' course of study in it. Yet such was his natural ability to learn from every one and everything, that the most throughly trained lawyers in that day of severe legal training were no match for him in debate on the abstract principles of law. As a member of the House of Burgesses of Virginia in 1765, he forced the colony into open opposition to England and, in connection with Thomas Jefferson and others, he led in the work of forming the first colonial Union. He served in the Continental Congress of 1774, and the next year, in the Virginia Convention, made his greatest speech — the speech which made retrogression impossible for Virginia and converted those who had been Loyalists to the mother country into traitors to the Commonwealth. His record as Governor of Virginia between 1776 and 1786 has little to do with his history as an orator, but in 1788, when it was proposed to adopt a Federal Constitution, uniting not the States themselves, but the people, he opposed it with the most extraordinary vehemence and brilliancy ever witnessed in really extemporaneous oratory. He was a Federalist in the sense of desiring a "Federal Union" — that is a Union by treaty — among the States, but he reasoned that a Union of the people of the States as proposed in the preamble of the Constitution was a complete consolidation in the presence of which the claim of State sovereignty and actual autonomy would be folly.

Losing on the main issue, the contest he had made resulted in the adoption of the first ten amendments. In 1799, on the issue against the Alien and Sedition Laws, the followers of Jefferson took the same position Henry had taken in the Virginia Convention, he sided against Jefferson and declared that since "unlimited power over sword and purse" had been intrusted to the Federal Government, there was nothing to do except submit to its exercise. The only remedy remaining, he said, was revolution, never to be resorted to except in the last extremity, and when resorted to, necessarily productive of conditions under which Americans "may bid adieu forever to representative government."

Henry died June 6th, 1799. He was one of the most remarkable men of modern times — unfortunate politically in his own generation only because he saw further into the future than any other man of his time dared attempt to see.

GIVE ME LIBERTY OR GIVE ME DEATH

(Delivered at Richmond, in the Virginia Convention, on a Resolution to put the Commonwealth into a State of Defense, March 23d, 1775)

Mr. President:—

NO MAN thinks more highly than I do of the patriotism, as well as abilities, of the very worthy gentlemen who have just addressed the house. But different men often see the same subject in different lights; and, therefore, I hope it will not be thought disrespectful to those gentlemen, if, entertaining as I do opinions of a character very opposite to theirs, I shall speak forth my sentiments freely and without reserve. This is no time for ceremony. The question before the house is one of awful moment to this country. For my own part, I consider it as nothing less than a question of freedom or slavery; and in proportion to the magnitude of the subject ought to be the freedom of the debate. It is only in this way that we can hope to arrive at truth, and fulfill the great responsibility which we hold to God and our country. Should I keep back my opinions at such a time, through fear of giving offense, I should consider myself as guilty of treason towards my country, and of an act of disloyalty toward the Majesty of Heaven, which I revere above all earthly kings.

Mr. President, it is natural to man to indulge in the illusions of hope. We are apt to shut our eyes against a painful truth, and listen to the song of that siren, till she transforms us into beasts. Is this the part of wise men, engaged in a great and arduous struggle for liberty? Are we disposed to be of the number of those, who, having eyes, see not, and having ears, hear not, the things which so nearly concern their temporal salvation? For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth; to know the worst, and to provide for it.

I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience. I know of no way of judging of the future but by the past. And judging by the past, I wish to know what there has been in the conduct of the British ministry for the last ten years to justify those hopes with which gentlemen have been pleased to solace themselves and the house. Is

it that insidious smile with which our petition has been lately received? Trust it not, sir; it will prove a snare to your feet. Suffer not yourselves to be betrayed with a kiss. Ask yourselves how this gracious reception of our petition comports with those warlike preparations which cover our waters and darken our land. Are fleets and armies necessary to a work of love and reconciliation? Have we shown ourselves so unwilling to be reconciled, that force must be called in to win back our love? Let us not deceive ourselves, sir. These are the implements of war and subjugation; the last arguments to which kings resort. I ask gentlemen, sir, What means this martial array, if its purpose be not to force us to submission? Can gentlemen assign any other possible motive for it? Has Great Britain any enemy, in this quarter of the world, to call for all this accumulation of navies and armies? No, sir, she has none. They are meant for us: they can be meant for no other. They are sent over to bind and rivet upon us those chains which the British ministry have been so long forging. And what have we to oppose to them? Shall we try argument? Sir, we have been trying that for the last ten years. Have we anything new to offer upon the subject? Nothing. We have held the subject up in every light of which it is capable; but it has been all in vain. Shall we resort to entreaty and humble supplication? What terms shall we find, which have not been already exhausted? Let us not, I beseech you, sir, deceive ourselves longer. Sir, we have done everything that could be done, to avert the storm which is now coming on. We have petitioned; we have remonstrated; we have supplicated; we have prostrated ourselves before the throne, and have implored its interposition to arrest the tyrannical hands of the ministry and Parliament. Our petitions have been slighted; our remonstrances have produced additional violence and insult; our supplications have been disregarded; and we have been spurned, with contempt, from the foot of the throne! In vain, after these things, may we indulge the fond hope of peace and reconciliation. There is no longer any room for hope. If we wish to be free — if we mean to preserve inviolate those inestimable privileges for which we have been so long contending — if we mean not basely to abandon the noble struggle in which we have been so long engaged, and which we have pledged ourselves never to abandon, until the glorious object of our contest shall be obtained — we must fight! I repeat it, sir, we mus'

fight! An appeal to arms and to the God of Hosts is all that is left us!

They tell us, sir, that we are weak; unable to cope with so formidable an adversary. But when shall we be stronger? Will it be the next week, or the next year? Will it be when we are totally disarmed, and when a British guard shall be stationed in every house? Shall we gather strength by irresolution and inaction? Shall we acquire the means of effectual resistance by lying supinely on our backs and hugging the delusive phantom of hope, until our enemies shall have bound us hand and foot? Sir, we are not weak, if we make a proper use of those means which the God of nature hath placed in our power. Three millions of people, armed in the holy cause of liberty, and in such a country as that which we possess, are invincible by any force which our enemy can send against us. Besides, sir, we shall not fight our battles alone. There is a just God who presides over the destinies of nations, and who will raise up friends to fight our battles for us. The battle, sir, is not to the strong alone; it is to the vigilant, the active, the brave. Besides, sir, we have no election. If we were base enough to desire it, it is now too late to retire from the contest. There is no retreat, but in submission and slavery! Our chains are forged! Their clanking may be heard on the plains of Boston! The war is inevitable—and let it come! I repeat it, sir, let it come.

It is in vain, sir, to extenuate the matter. Gentlemen may cry, Peace, Peace—but there is no peace. The war is actually begun! The next gale that sweeps from the north will bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms! Our brethren are already in the field! Why stand we here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!

«WE THE PEOPLE» OR «WE THE STATES?»

(Delivered in the Virginia Convention, June 4th, 1788, on the Preamble and the First Two Sections of the First Article of the Federal Constitution)

Mr. Chairman:—

THE public mind, as well as my own, is extremely uneasy at the proposed change of government. Give me leave to form one of the number of those who wish to be thoroughly acquainted with the reasons of this perilous and uneasy situation, and why we are brought hither to decide on this great national question. I consider myself as the servant of the people of this Commonwealth, as a sentinel over their rights, liberty, and happiness. I represent their feelings when I say that they are exceedingly uneasy, being brought from that state of full security, which they enjoy, to the present delusive appearance of things. Before the meeting of the late Federal Convention at Philadelphia, a general peace and a universal tranquillity prevailed in this country, and the minds of our citizens were at perfect repose; but since that period, they are exceedingly uneasy and disquieted. When I wished for an appointment to this convention, my mind was extremely agitated for the situation of public affairs. I conceive the Republic to be in extreme danger. If our situation be thus uneasy, whence has arisen this fearful jeopardy? It arises from this fatal system; it arises from a proposal to change our government—a proposal that goes to the utter annihilation of the most solemn engagements of the States—a proposal of establishing nine States into a confederacy, to the eventual exclusion of four States. It goes to the annihilation of those solemn treaties we have formed with foreign nations. The present circumstances of France, the good offices rendered us by that kingdom, require our most faithful and most punctual adherence to our treaty with her. We are in alliance with the Spaniards, the Dutch, the Prussians: those treaties bound us as thirteen States, confederated together. Yet here is a proposal to sever that confederacy. Is it possible that we shall abandon all our treaties and national engagements? And for what? I expected to have heard the reasons of an event so unexpected to my mind, and many others. Was our civil polity, or public justice, endangered or sapped? Was the real existence of the country threatened, or was this preceded by a

mournful progression of events? This proposal of altering our Federal Government is of a most alarming nature; make the best of this new Government — say it is composed of anything but inspiration — you ought to be extremely cautious, watchful, jealous of your liberty; for, instead of securing your rights, you may lose them forever. If a wrong step be now made, the Republic may be lost forever. If this new Government will not come up to the expectation of the people, and they should be disappointed, their liberty will be lost, and tyranny must and will arise. I repeat it again, and I beg gentlemen to consider, that a wrong step, made now, will plunge us into misery, and our Republic will be lost. It will be necessary for this convention to have a faithful historical detail of the facts that preceded the session of the Federal Convention, and the reasons that actuated its members in proposing an entire alteration of government — and to demonstrate the dangers that awaited us. If they were of such awful magnitude as to warrant a proposal so extremely perilous as this, I must assert that this convention has an absolute right to a thorough discovery of every circumstance relative to this great event. And here I would make this inquiry of those worthy characters who composed a part of the late Federal Convention. I am sure they were fully impressed with the necessity of forming a great consolidated government, instead of a confederation. That this is a consolidated government is demonstrably clear, and the danger of such a government is, to my mind, very striking. I have the highest veneration for those gentlemen; but, sir, give me leave to demand what right had they to say, "We, the People"? My political curiosity, exclusive of my anxious solicitude for the public welfare, leads me to ask who authorized them to speak the language of "We, the People," instead of "We, the States"? States are the characteristics and the soul of a confederation. If the States be not the agents of this compact, it must be one great consolidated national government of the people of all the States. I have the highest respect for those gentlemen who formed the convention; and were some of them not here, I would express some testimonial of esteem for them. America had, on a former occasion, put the utmost confidence in them — a confidence which was well placed; and I am sure, sir, I would give up anything to them; I would cheerfully confide in them as my representatives. But, sir, on this great occasion, I would demand the cause of their conduct. Even from

that illustrious man, who saved us by his valor, I would have a reason for his conduct; that liberty which he has given us by his valor tells me to ask this reason, and sure I am, were he here, he would give us that reason: but there are other gentlemen here who can give us this information. The people gave them no power to use their name. That they exceeded their power is perfectly clear. It is not mere curiosity that actuates me; I wish to hear the real, actual, existing danger, which should lead us to take those steps so dangerous in my conception. Disorders have arisen in other parts of America, but here, sir, no dangers, no insurrection or tumult, has happened; everything has been calm and tranquil. But notwithstanding this, we are wandering on the great ocean of human affairs. I see no landmark to guide us. We are running we know not whither. Difference in opinion has gone to a degree of inflammatory resentment in different parts of the country, which has been occasioned by this perilous innovation. The Federal Convention ought to have amended the old system; for this purpose they were solely delegated: the object of their mission extended to no other consideration. You must therefore forgive the solicitation of one unworthy member to know what danger could have arisen under the present confederation, and what are the causes of this proposal to change our government.

«A NATION,—NOT A FEDERATION»

(Delivered in the Virginia Convention of the Commonwealth of Virginia, on the Eighth Section of the Federal Constitution)

Mr. Chairman:—

It is now confessed that this is a national government. There is not a single federal feature in it. It has been alleged, within these walls, during the debates, to be national and federal, as it suited the arguments of gentlemen.

But now, when we have heard the definition of it, it is purely national. The honorable member was pleased to say that the sword and purse included everything of consequence. And shall we trust them out of our hands without checks and barriers? The sword and purse are essentially necessary for the government. Every essential requisite must be in Congress. Where are the purse and sword of Virginia? They must go to Con-

gress. What is become of your country? The Virginian government is but a name. It clearly results, from his last argument, that we are to be consolidated. We should be thought unwise, indeed, to keep two hundred legislators in Virginia, when the government is, in fact, gone to Philadelphia or New York. We are, as a State, to form no part of the government. Where are your checks? The most essential objects of government are to be administered by Congress. How, then, can the State governments be any check upon them? If we are to be a republican government, it will be consolidated, not confederated.

The means, says the gentleman, must be commensurate to the end. How does this apply? All things in common are left with this government. There being an infinitude in the government, there must be an infinitude of means to carry it on. This is a sort of mathematical government that may appear well on paper, but cannot sustain examination, or be safely reduced to practice. The delegation of power to an adequate number of representatives, and an unimpeded reversion of it back to the people, at short periods, form the principal traits of a republican government. The idea of a republican government, in that paper, is something superior to the poor people. The governing persons are the servants of the people. There, the servants are greater than their masters; because it includes infinitude, and infinitude excludes every idea of subordination. In this the creature has destroyed and soared above the Creator. For if its powers be infinite, what rights have the people remaining? By that very argument, despotism has made way in all countries where the people unfortunately have been enslaved by it. We are told, the sword and purse are necessary for the national defense. The junction of these, without limitation, in the same hands, is, by logical and mathematical conclusions, the description of despotism.

The reasons adduced here to-day have long ago been advanced in favor of passive obedience and nonresistance. In 1688, the British nation expelled their monarch for attempting to trample on their liberties. The doctrine of Divine Right and Passive Obedience was said to be commanded by Heaven — it was inculcated by his minions and adherents. He wanted to possess, without control, the sword and purse. The attempt cost him his crown. This government demands the same powers. I see reason to be more and more alarmed. I fear it will terminate in

despotism. As to his objection of the abuse of liberty, it is denied. The political inquiries and promotions of the peasants are a happy circumstance. A foundation of knowledge is a great mark of happiness. When the spirit of inquiry after political discernment goes forth among the lowest of the people, it rejoices my heart. Why such fearful apprehensions? I defy him to show that liberty has been abused. There has been no rebellion here, though there was in Massachusetts. Tell me of any country which has been so long without a rebellion. Distresses have been patiently borne in this country, which would have produced revolutions in other countries. We strained every nerve to make provisions to pay off our soldiers and officers. They, though not paid, and greatly distressed at the conclusion of the war, magnanimously acquiesced. The depreciation of the circulating currency very much involved many of them, and thousands of other citizens, in absolute ruin; but the same patient fortitude and forbearance marked their conduct. What would the people of England have done in such a situation? They would have resisted the government, and murdered the tyrant. But in this country, no abuse of power has taken place. It is only a general assertion, unsupported, which suggests the contrary. Individual licentiousness will show its baneful consequences in every country, let its government be what it may.

But the honorable gentleman says responsibility will exist more in this than in the British Government. It exists here more in name than anything else. I need not speak of the executive authority. But consider the two houses — the American Parliament. Are the members of the Senate responsible? They may try themselves, and, if found guilty on impeachment, are to be only removed from office. In England the greatest characters are brought to the block for their sinister administration. They have a power there, not to dismiss them from office, but from life, for malpractices. The King himself cannot pardon in this case. How does it stand with respect to your lower house? You have but ten. Whatever number may be there, six is a majority. Will your country afford no temptation, no money to corrupt them? Cannot six fat places be found to accommodate them? They may, after the first Congress, take any place. There will be a multiplicity of places. Suppose they corruptly obtain places. Where will you find them to punish them? At the furthest parts of the Union; in the ten miles square, or within a

State where there is a stronghold. What are you to do when these men return from Philadelphia? Two things are to be done. To detect the offender and bring him to punishment. You will find it difficult to do either.

In England, the proceedings are openly transacted. They deliver their opinions freely and openly. They do not fear all Europe. Compare it to this. You cannot detect the guilty. The publication from time to time is merely optional in them. They may prolong the period, or suppress it altogether, under pretense of its being necessary to be kept secret. The yeas and nays will avail nothing. Is the publication daily? It may be a year, or once in a century. I know this would be an unfair construction in the common concerns of life. But it would satisfy the words of the Constitution. It would be some security were it once a year, or even once in two years. When the new election comes on, unless you detect them, what becomes of your responsibility? Will they discover their guilt when they wish to be re-elected? This would suppose them to be, not only bad men, but foolish men, in pursuit of responsibility. Have you a right to scrutinize into the conduct of your representatives? Can any man, who conceives himself injured, go and demand a sight of their journals? But it will be told that I am suspicious. I am answered, to every question, that they will be good men. In England, they see daily what is doing in Parliament. They will hear from their Parliament in one thirty-ninth part of the time that we shall hear from Congress in this scattered country. Let it be proposed, in England, to lay a poll tax, or enter into any measure, that will injure one part and produce emoluments to another, intelligence will fly quickly as the rays of light to the people. They will instruct their representatives to oppose it, and will petition against it, and get it prevented or redressed instantly. Impeachment follows quickly a violation of duty. Will it be so here? You must detect the offense, and punish the defaulter. How will this be done when you know not the offender, even though he had a previous design to commit the misdemeanor? Your Parliament will consist of sixty-five. Your share will be ten out of the sixty-five. Will they not take shelter, by saying they were in the minority — that the men from New Hampshire and Kentucky outvoted them? Thus will responsibility, that great pillar of a free government, be taken away.

The honorable gentleman wished to try the experiment. Loving his country as he does, he would not surely wish to trust his happiness to an experiment, from which much harm, but no good, may result.

I will speak another time, and will not fatigue the committee now. I think the friends of the opposition ought to make a pause here; for I can see no safety to my country, if you give up this power.

THE BILL OF RIGHTS

(Delivered in the Virginia Convention on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution, June 14th, 1788)

Mr. Chairman: —

The necessity of a Bill of Rights appears to me to be greater in this government than ever it was in any government before. I have observed already that the sense of the European nations, and particularly Great Britain, is against the construction of rights being retained which are not expressly relinquished. I repeat that all nations have adopted this construction — that all rights not expressly and unequivocally reserved to the people are impliedly and incidentally relinquished to rulers, as necessarily inseparable from the delegated powers. It is so in Great Britain; for every possible right, which is not reserved to the people by some express provision or compact, is within the king's prerogative. It is so in that country which is said to be in such full possession of freedom. It is so in Spain, Germany, and other parts of the world. Let us consider the sentiments which have been entertained by the people of America on this subject. At the Revolution, it must be admitted that it was their sense to set down those great rights which ought, in all countries, to be held inviolable and sacred. Virginia did so, we all remember. She made a compact to reserve, expressly, certain rights.

When fortified with full, adequate, and abundant representation, was she satisfied with that representation? No. She most cautiously and guardedly reserved and secured those invaluable, inestimable rights and privileges which no people inspired with the least glow of patriotic liberty ever did, or ever can, aban-

don. She is called upon now to abandon them and dissolve that compact which secured them to her. She is called upon to accede to another compact which most infallibly supersedes and annihilates her present one. Will she do it? This is the question. If you intend to reserve your unalienable rights, you must have the most express stipulation; for if implication be allowed, you are ousted of those rights. If the people do not think it necessary to reserve them, they will be supposed to be given up. How were the congressional rights defined when the people of America united by a confederacy to defend their liberties and rights against the tyrannical attempts of Great Britain? The States were not then contented with implied reservation. No, Mr. Chairman. It was expressly declared in our Confederation that every right was retained by the States, respectively, which was not given up to the government of the United States. But there is no such thing here. You, therefore, by a natural and unavoidable implication, give up your rights to the general government.

Your own example furnishes an argument against it. If you give up these powers, without a Bill of Rights, you will exhibit the most absurd thing to mankind that ever the world saw — a government that has abandoned all its powers — the powers of direct taxation, the sword, and the purse. You have disposed of them to Congress, without a Bill of Rights — without check, limitation, or control. And still you have checks and guards; still you keep barriers — pointed where? Pointed against your weakened, prostrated, enervated State government! You have a Bill of Rights to defend you against the State government, which is bereaved of all power, and yet you have none against Congress, though in full and exclusive possession of all power! You arm yourselves against the weak and defenseless, and expose yourselves naked to the armed and powerful. Is not this conduct of unexampled absurdity? What barriers have you to oppose to this most strong, energetic government? To that government you have nothing to oppose. All your defense is given up. This is a real, actual defect. It must strike the mind of every gentleman. When our government was first instituted in Virginia, we declared the common law of England to be in force.

That system of law which has been admired and has protected us and our ancestors is excluded by that system. Added to this, we adopted a Bill of Rights. By this Constitution some of the

best barriers of human rights are thrown away. Is there not an additional reason to have a Bill of Rights? By the ancient common law the trial of all facts is decided by a jury of impartial men from the immediate vicinage. This paper speaks of different juries from the common law in criminal cases; and in civil controversies excludes trial by jury altogether. There is, therefore, more occasion for the supplementary check of a Bill of Rights now than then. Congress, from their general powers, may fully go into the business of human legislation. They may be legislative in criminal cases, from treason to the lowest offense — petty larceny. They may define crimes and prescribe punishments. In the definition of crimes, I trust they will be directed by what wise representatives ought to be governed by. But when we come to punishments, no latitude ought to be left, nor dependence put on the virtue of representatives. What says our Bill of Rights? — "that excessive bail ought not to be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted." Are you not, therefore, now calling on those gentlemen who are to compose Congress to prescribe trials and define punishments without this control? Will they find sentiments there similar to this Bill of Rights? You let them loose; you do more — you depart from the genius of your country. That paper tells you that the trial of crimes shall be by jury, and held in the State where the crime shall have been committed. Under this extensive provision, they may proceed in a manner extremely dangerous to liberty; a person accused may be carried from one extremity of the State to another, and be tried not by an impartial jury of the vicinage, acquainted with his character and the circumstances of the fact, but by a jury unacquainted with both, and who may be biased against him. Is not this sufficient to alarm men? How different is this from the immemorial practice of your British ancestors and your own! I need not tell you that, by the common law, a number of hundreders were required on a jury, and that afterwards it was sufficient if the jurors came from the same county. With less than this the people of England have never been satisfied. That paper ought to have declared the common law in force.

In this business of legislation, your members of Congress will lose the restriction of not imposing excessive fines, demanding excessive bail, and inflicting cruel and unusual punishments. These are prohibited by your Declaration of Rights. What has

distinguished our ancestors? That they would not admit of tortures, or cruel and barbarous punishment. But Congress may introduce the practice of the civil law, in preference to that of the common law. They may introduce the practice of France, Spain, and Germany,—of torturing, to extort a confession of crime. They will say that they might as well draw examples from those countries as from Great Britain, and they will tell you that there is such a necessity of strengthening the arm of government, that they must have a criminal equity, and extort confession by torture, in order to punish with still more relentless severity. We are then lost and undone. And can any man think it troublesome, when we can, by a small interference, prevent our rights from being lost? If you will, like the Virginian government, give them knowledge of the extent of the rights retained by the people, and the powers of themselves, they will, if they be honest men, thank you for it. Will they not wish to go on sure grounds? But if you leave them otherwise, they will not know how to proceed; and, being in a state of uncertainty, they will assume rather than give up powers of implication.

A Bill of Rights may be summed up in a few words. What do they tell us? That our rights are reserved. Why not say so? Is it because it will consume too much paper? Gentlemen's reasoning against a Bill of Rights does not satisfy me. Without saying which has the right side, it remains doubtful. A Bill of Rights is a favorite thing with the Virginians and the people of the other States likewise. It may be their prejudice, but the government ought to suit their geniuses; otherwise, its operation will be unhappy. A Bill of Rights, even if its necessity be doubtful, will exclude the possibility of dispute; and, with great submission, I think the best way is to have no dispute. In the present Constitution, they are restrained from issuing general warrants to search suspected places, or seize persons not named, without evidence of the commission of a fact, etc. There was certainly some celestial influence governing those who deliberated on that Constitution; for they have, with the most cautious and enlightened circumspection, guarded those indefeasible rights which ought ever to be held sacred! The officers of Congress may come upon you now, fortified with all the terrors of paramount federal authority. Excisemen may come in multitudes; for the limitation of their numbers no man knows. They may, unless the general government be restrained by a Bill of Rights, or some

similar restriction, go into your cellars and rooms, and search, ransack, and measure, everything you eat, drink, and wear. They ought to be restrained within proper bounds. With respect to the freedom of the press, I need say nothing; for it is hoped that the gentlemen who shall compose Congress will take care to infringe as little as possible the rights of human nature. This will result from their integrity. They should, from prudence, abstain from violating the rights of their constituents. They are not, however, expressly restrained. But whether they will intermeddle with that palladium of our liberties or not, I leave you to determine.

LIBERTY OR EMPIRE?

(From the Speech of June 5th, 1788, in the Virginia Constitutional Convention)

WHAT, sir, is the genius of democracy? Let me read that clause of the Bill of Rights of Virginia which relates to this: —

«CLAUSE III. — That government is, or ought to be, instituted for the common benefit, protection, and security of the people, nation, or community. Of all the various modes and forms of government, that is best which is capable of producing the greatest degree of happiness and safety, and is most effectually secured against the danger of maladministration; and that whenever any government shall be found inadequate or contrary to those purposes, a majority of the community hath an indubitable, unalienable, and indefeasible right to reform, alter, or abolish it, in such manner as shall be judged most conducive to the public weal.»

This, sir, is the language of democracy — that a majority of the community have a right to alter government when found to be oppressive. But how different is the genius of your new Constitution from this! How different from the sentiments of freemen, that a contemptible minority can prevent the good of the majority! If, then, gentlemen standing on this ground are come to that point, that they are willing to bind themselves and their posterity to be oppressed, I am amazed and inexpressibly astonished. If this be the opinion of the majority, I must submit; but to me, sir, it appears perilous and destructive. I cannot help thinking so. Perhaps it may be the result of my age. These may be feelings natural to a man of my years, when the Ameri-

can spirit has left him, and his mental powers, like the members of the body, are decayed. If, sir, amendments are left to the twentieth, or tenth part of the people of America, your liberty is gone forever. We have heard that there is a great deal of bribery practiced in the House of Commons in England, and that many of the members raise themselves to preferments by selling the rights of the whole of the people. But, sir, the tenth part of that body cannot continue oppressions on the rest of the people. English liberty is, in this case, on a firmer foundation than American liberty. It will be easily contrived to procure the opposition of one-tenth of the people to any alteration, however judicious. The honorable gentleman who presides told us that, to prevent abuses in our government, we will assemble in convention, recall our delegated powers, and punish our servants for abusing the trust reposed in them. O sir! we should have fine times, indeed, if, to punish tyrants, it were only sufficient to assemble the people! Your arms, wherewith you could defend yourselves, are gone; and you have no longer an aristocratical, no longer a democratical spirit. Did you ever read of any revolution in a nation, brought about by the punishment of those in power, inflicted by those who had no power at all? You read of a riot act in a country which is called one of the freest in the world, where a few neighbors cannot assemble without the risk of being shot by a hired soldiery, the engines of despotism. We may see such an act in America.

A standing army we shall have, also, to execute the execrable commands of tyranny; and how are you to punish them? Will you order them to be punished? Who shall obey these orders? Will your mace bearer be a match for a disciplined regiment? In what situation are we to be? The clause before you gives a power of direct taxation, unbounded and unlimited,—an exclusive power of legislation, in all cases whatsoever, for ten miles square, and over all places purchased for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, etc. What resistance could be made? The attempt would be madness. You will find all the strength of this country in the hands of your enemies; their garrisons will naturally be the strongest places in the country. Your militia is given up to Congress, also, in another part of this plan; they will therefore act as they think proper: all power will be in their own possession. You cannot force them to receive their punishment; of what service would militia be to you,

when, most probably, you will not have a single musket in the State? For, as arms are to be provided by Congress, they may or may not furnish them.

Let me here call your attention to that part which gives the Congress power "to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States; reserving to the States, respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress." By this, sir, you see that their control over our last and best defense is unlimited. If they neglect or refuse to discipline or arm our militia, they will be useless; the States can do neither, this power being exclusively given to Congress. The power of appointing officers over men not disciplined or armed is ridiculous; so that this pretended little remains of power left to the States may, at the pleasure of Congress, be rendered nugatory. Our situation will be deplorable indeed; nor can we ever expect to get this government amended, since I have already shown that a very small minority may prevent it, and that small minority interested in the continuance of the oppression. Will the oppressor let go the oppressed? Was there ever an instance? Can the annals of mankind exhibit one single example where rulers overcharged with power willingly let go the oppressed, though solicited and requested most earnestly? The application for amendments will therefore be fruitless. Sometimes the oppressed have got loose by one of those bloody struggles that desolate a country; but a willing relinquishment of power is one of those things which human nature never was, nor ever will be, capable of.

The honorable gentleman's observations respecting the people's right of being the agents in the formation of this government are not accurate, in my humble conception. The distinction between a national government and a confederacy is not sufficiently discerned. Had the delegates who were sent to Philadelphia a power to propose a consolidated government instead of a confederacy? Were they not deputed by States, and not by the people? The assent of the people, in their collective capacity, is not necessary to the formation of a federal government. The people have no right to enter into leagues, alliances, or confederations; they are not the proper agents for this purpose. States and foreign powers are the only proper agents for this kind of

government. Show me an instance where the people have exercised this business. Has it not always gone through the legislatures? I refer you to the treaties with France, Holland, and other nations. How were they made? Were they not made by the States? Are the people, therefore, in their aggregate capacity, the proper persons to form a confederacy? This, therefore, ought to depend on the consent of the legislatures, the people having sent delegates to make any proposition for changing the government. Yet I must say, at the same time, that it was made on grounds the most pure; and, perhaps, I might have been brought to consent to it as far as to the change of government. But there is one thing in it which I never would acquiesce in. I mean the changing it into a consolidated government, which is so abhorrent to my mind.

The honorable gentleman then went on to the figure we make with foreign nations; the contemptible one we make in France and Holland, which, according to the substance of the notes, he attributes to the present feeble government. An opinion has gone forth, we find, that we are contemptible people; the time has been when we were thought otherwise. Under the same despised government we commanded the respect of all Europe; wherefore are we now reckoned otherwise? The American spirit has fled from hence; it has gone to regions where it has never been expected; it has gone to the people of France in search of a splendid government, a strong, energetic government. Shall we imitate the example of those nations who have gone from a simple to a splendid government? Are those nations more worthy of our imitation? What can make an adequate satisfaction to them for the loss they have suffered in attaining such a government — for the loss of their liberty? If we admit this consolidated government, it will be because we like a great, splendid one. Some way or other we must be a great and mighty empire; we must have an army, and a navy, and a number of things. When the American spirit was in its youth, the language of America was different; liberty, sir, was then the primary object. We are descended from a people whose government was founded on liberty; our glorious forefathers of Great Britain made liberty the foundation of everything. That country is become a great, mighty, and splendid nation; not because their government is strong and energetic, but, sir, because liberty is its direct end and foundation. We drew the spirit of liberty from our British

ancestors; by that spirit we have triumphed over every difficulty. But now, sir, the American spirit, assisted by the ropes and chains of consolidation, is about to convert this country into a powerful and mighty empire. If you make the citizens of this country agree to become the subjects of one great consolidated empire of America, your government will not have sufficient energy to keep them together. Such a government is incompatible with the genius of republicanism. There will be no checks, no real balances in this government. What can avail your specious, imaginary balances, your rope dancing, chain rattling, ridiculous ideal checks and contrivances? But, sir, "we are not feared by foreigners; we do not make nations tremble." Would this constitute happiness or secure liberty? I trust, sir, our political hemisphere will ever direct their operations to the security of those objects.

Consider our situation, sir; go to the poor man and ask him what he does. He will inform you that he enjoys the fruits of his labor, under his own fig tree, with his wife and children around him, in peace and security. Go to every other member of society; you will find the same tranquil ease and content; you will find no alarms or disturbances. Why, then, tell us of danger, to terrify us into an adoption of this new form of government? And yet who knows the dangers that this new system may produce? They are out of the sight of the common people; they cannot foresee latent consequences. I dread the operation of it on the middling and lower classes of people; it is for them I fear the adoption of this system. I fear I tire the patience of the committee, but I beg to be indulged with a few more observations. When I thus profess myself an advocate for the liberty of the people, I shall be told I am a designing man, that I am to be a great man, that I am to be a demagogue; and many similar illiberal insinuations will be thrown out: but, sir, conscious rectitude outweighs those things with me. I see great jeopardy in this new government. I see none from our present one. I hope some gentleman or other will bring forth, in full array, those dangers, if there be any, that we may see and touch them. I have said that I thought this a consolidated government; I will now prove it. Will the great rights of the people be secured by this government? Suppose it should prove oppressive, how can it be altered? Our Bill of Rights declares that "a majority of the community hath an indubitable, unalienable, and indefeasible

right to reform, alter, or abolish it, in such manner as shall be judged most conducive to the public weal."

I have just proved that one-tenth, or less, of the people of America — a most despicable minority — may prevent this reform or alteration. Suppose the people of Virginia should wish to alter their government; can a majority of them do it? No; because they are connected with other men, or, in other words, consolidated with other States. When the people of Virginia, at a future day, shall wish to alter their government, though they should be unanimous in this desire, yet they may be prevented therefrom by a despicable minority at the extremity of the United States. The founders of your own Constitution made your government changeable; but the power of changing it is gone from you. Whither is it gone? It is placed in the same hands that hold the rights of twelve other States; and those who hold those rights have right and power to keep them. It is not the particular government of Virginia; one of the leading features of that government is that a majority can alter it when necessary for the public good. This government is not a Virginian, but an American government. Is it not, therefore, a consolidated government? The sixth clause of your Bill of Rights tells you, "that elections of members to serve as representatives of the people in assembly ought to be free, and that all men having sufficient evidence of permanent common interest with, and attachment to the community, have the right of suffrage, and cannot be taxed, or deprived of their property for public uses, without their own consent, or that of their representatives so elected, nor bound by any law to which they have not in like manner assented for the public good." But what does this Constitution say? The clause under consideration gives an unlimited and unbounded power of taxation. Suppose every delegate from Virginia opposes a law laying a tax; what will it avail? They are oppressed by a majority; eleven members can destroy their efforts: those feeble ten cannot prevent the passage of the most oppressive tax law; so that, in direct opposition to the spirit and express language of your Declaration of Rights, you are taxed, not by your own consent, but by people who have no connection with you.

The next clause of the Bill of Rights tells you "that all power of suspending law, or the execution of laws, by any authority, without the consent of the representatives of the people, is injurious to their rights, and ought not to be exercised." This

tells us that there can be no suspension of government or laws without our own consent; yet this Constitution can counteract and suspend any of our laws that contravene its oppressive operation; for they have the power of direct taxation, which suspends our Bill of Rights; and it is expressly provided that they can make all laws necessary for carrying their powers into execution; and it is declared paramount to the laws and constitutions of the States. Consider how the only remaining defense we have left is destroyed in this manner. Besides the expenses of maintaining the Senate and other House in as much splendor as they please, there is to be a great and mighty President, with very extensive powers — the powers of a king. He is to be supported in extravagant magnificence; so that the whole of our property may be taken by this American Government, by laying what taxes they please, giving themselves what salaries they please, and suspending our laws at their pleasure. I might be thought too inquisitive, but I believe I should take up very little of your time in enumerating the little power that is left to the government of Virginia, for this power is reduced to little or nothing; their garrisons, magazines, arsenals, and forts, which will be situated in the strongest places within the States; their ten-mile square, with all the fine ornaments of human life, added to their powers, and taken from the States, will reduce the power of the latter to nothing.

The voice of tradition, I trust, will inform posterity of our struggles for freedom. If our descendants be worthy the name of Americans, they will preserve, and hand down to their latest posterity, the transactions of the present times; and, though I confess my exclamations are not worthy the hearing, they will see that I have done my utmost to preserve their liberty; for I never will give up the power of direct taxation but for a scourge. I am willing to give it conditionally; that is, after noncompliance with requisitions. I will do more, sir, and what I hope will convince the most skeptical man that I am a lover of the American Union; that, in case Virginia shall not make punctual payment, the control of our customhouses, and the whole regulation of trade, shall be given to Congress, and that Virginia shall depend on Congress even for passports, till Virginia shall have paid the last farthing, and furnished the last soldier. Nay, sir, there is another alternative to which I would consent; even that they should strike us out of the Union and take away from us all

federal privileges, till we comply with federal requisitions: but let it depend upon our own pleasure to pay our money in the most easy manner for our people. Were all the States, more terrible than the mother country, to join against us, I hope Virginia could defend herself; but, sir, the dissolution of the Union is most abhorrent to my mind. The first thing I have at heart is American liberty; the second thing is American union; and I hope the people of Virginia will endeavor to preserve that union. The increasing population of the Southern States is far greater than that of New England; consequently, in a short time, they will be far more numerous than the people of that country. Consider this, and you will find this State more particularly interested to support American liberty and not bind our posterity by an improvident relinquishment of our rights. I would give the best security for a punctual compliance with requisitions; but I beseech gentlemen, at all hazards, not to give up this unlimited power of taxation. The honorable gentleman has told us that these powers, given to Congress, are accompanied by a judiciary which will correct all. On examination, you will find this very judiciary oppressively constructed, your jury trial destroyed, and the judges dependent on Congress. . . .

This Constitution is said to have beautiful features; but when I come to examine these features, sir, they appear to me horribly frightful. Among other deformities, it has an awful squinting; its squints toward monarchy; and does not this raise indignation in the breast of every true American? Your President may easily become king. Your Senate is so imperfectly constructed that your dearest rights may be sacrificed by what may be a small minority; and a very small minority may continue forever unchangeably this government, although horridly defective. Where are your checks in this government? Your strongholds will be in the hands of your enemies. It is on a supposition that your American governors shall be honest, that all the good qualities of this government are founded; but its defective and imperfect construction puts it in their power to perpetrate the worst of mischiefs, should they be bad men; and, sir, would not all the world, from the Eastern to the Western Hemisphere, blame our distracted folly in resting our rights upon the contingency of our rulers being good or bad? Show me that age and country where the rights and liberties of the people were placed on the sole chance of their rulers being good men, without a conse-

quent loss of liberty! I say that the loss of that dearest privilege has ever followed, with absolute certainty, every such mad attempt.

If your American chief be a man of ambition and abilities, how easy is it for him to render himself absolute! The army is in his hands, and if he be a man of address, it will be attached to him, and it will be the subject of long meditation with him to seize the first auspicious moment to accomplish his design; and, sir, will the American spirit solely relieve you when this happens? I would rather infinitely — and I am sure most of this convention are of the same opinion — have a king, lords, and commons, than a government so replete with such insupportable evils. If we make a king, we may prescribe the rules by which he shall rule his people, and interpose such checks as shall prevent him from infringing them; but the President, in the field, at the head of his army, can prescribe the terms on which he shall reign master, so far that it will puzzle any American ever to get his neck from under the galling yoke. I cannot with patience think of this idea. If ever he violate the laws, one of two things will happen: he will come at the head of the army to carry everything before him; or he will give bail, or do what Mr. Chief-Justice will order him. If he be guilty, will not the recollection of his crimes teach him to make one bold push for the American throne? Will not the immense difference between being master of everything and being ignominiously tried and punished powerfully excite him to make this bold push? But, sir, where is the existing force to punish him? Can he not, at the head of his army, beat down every opposition? Away with your President! we shall have a king: the army will salute him monarch; your militia will leave you, and assist in making him king, and fight against you: and what have you to oppose this force? What will then become of you and your rights? Will not absolute despotism ensue?

JOHANN GOTTFRIED VON HERDER

(1744–1803)

JOHANN GOTTFRIED VON HERDER was born at Mohrungen, East Prussia, August 25th, 1744—five years before the birth of Goethe, with whose great work as the regenerator of German literature, he was intimately associated. At a time when literary Germany was almost completely dominated by French taste, Herder turned from the artificiality of Parisian models to study the simplicities of the popular creative instinct, illustrated in such ballads as those of Scotland, and such lyrics as the 'Folk-Songs of Germany.' He taught Germany to study the 'Odyssey' and the 'Book of Job' and to look for models of perfection among simple and natural people rather than among the polished and polite. In place of the literary courtliness which Germany was attempting to imitate from Paris, he gave it the idea which made possible Goethe and Schiller. Herder's father was the schoolmaster of his native village. The family were poor, and Herder's education was obtained largely through his own exertions. After graduating in Divinity he was a teacher at Riga from 1764 to 1769. In 1771 he became Court preacher at Bueckburg, and in 1776, through the influence of Goethe, he was called to the same office at Weimar. He died in 1803, and on the cast-iron tablet over his grave were inscribed as his epitaph the three words: "Licht, Liebe, Leben"—Light, Love, Life! Had not Herder's influence as a reformer of taste made possible the best work of Goethe and Schiller, he himself might have ranked as the greatest literary man of Germany in his day. He was a poet of no mean talent, with an oratorical faculty worthy of his education and his gifts.

THE MEANING OF INSPIRATION

(From a Sermon on Romans xv. 4–13)

Now what do we mean, my hearers, when we call the Bible the word of God? Do we mean that these are just God's thoughts, which he thinks upon this and that subject? Is it that he so speaks with himself? that this is his mode of conception? Is this what we mean? Not the least in the world.

With God, the All-Knowing and Perfect One, it is all one thought. He thinks without words, without a series of reflections. He thinks all things from the centre outward, and not simply as we think them from the outside. We learn everything through the senses, and therefore know them from without, from the surface, from one side. We learn first to think by means of speech, and from our youth up we repeat the words of others, and so think according to them. All general truths, all abstract propositions, all deliberations of the understanding can be entertained only through words. We speak with ourselves while we think; we reason with ourselves while we speak. But with God there is nothing of all this. He knows nothing of that weakness which demands words for thoughts; he thinks without the husks of words, without meagre confusing symbols, without any series of conceptions or classes of ideas. With him all is one single, perfect thought.

Every one who has understood me sees that the Bible is not called "The word of God" in the sense that it is a series of such thoughts as God speaks with himself, for God speaks not. Or as if it were the dialect of the gods and of heaven, as the heathen called that of their poets; for God has properly for himself no words with which he must reckon as with counters, and teach himself as with ciphers. And how nugatory now becomes the charge which is drawn from the lowliness of the words in which God is said to have revealed himself. Thou fool! so far as it pertains to God himself, even the highest, the most majestic, the most significant words are for him imperfection. They may be crutches on which we, limited men, can hobble along; but the Deity, who is all thought, needs them not. They are the tokens of our imperfection: and wilt thou lend them to the perfect God? Thou wilt listen to his thoughts, and what words are worthy of expressing them? Thou fool! before God there is no word, no speech worthy of him.

Now if we suppose that God wished to reveal himself to man, and yet otherwise than in his essential nature, how else could he do it but by human agency? How can he speak to man otherwise? to imperfect men, otherwise than in the imperfect, defective language in which they can understand him, and to which they are accustomed? I use far too inadequate a comparison for our purpose, when I say that a father speaks to a child only in a childish way; for between them both there still exists a

relationship. Father and child are yet both akin, who can think no otherwise than by words, and have a common language of reason. But between God and men there is no correspondence; they have, as it were, nothing at all in common as a basis of mutual understanding. God must, therefore, explain himself to men altogether in a human way, according to our own mode and speech, suitably to our weakness and the narrowness of our ideas; he cannot speak like a god, he must speak altogether like a man.

Had this been considered, how could men have pried into so many useless subtleties connected with this subject — into mysteries and things which they absolutely could not understand? Let us take, for example, the history of the creation. The wisest, most learned, most experienced physiologists, if they are honest, have readily and openly acknowledged that they have not even advanced so far as to be able to conceive how it is possible for a material body to exist; much less, how it comes into existence; and more than all is it impossible for them to conceive how a spirit exists according to its inmost essence — what it is, and how it comes into existence. And if this is a matter absolutely inconceivable for man, in what way can he comprehend how a world, which was not, should be; that a world of living spirits should come into existence and continue, and that each one should in himself enjoy the whole world, and each thing in it be a world? What human understanding can comprehend this when it is so difficult for us even to seize it in our imaginations? What human speech can express it? How must God, therefore, in his own revelation concerning the creation, have been constrained to stoop far lower to our apprehensions than we do when speaking with children! And what foolish children are we if we rack our brains about that which is not at all for us to comprehend, and which God could not have revealed to us without our ceasing to be sensuous men and becoming as gods! And how wretched, therefore, are all our subtle queries and doubtings upon this subject, when we undertake to solve the origin of the world out of nothing, and speculate respecting time and eternity — how they separate themselves, and flow into each other; respecting the destruction and the end of the world; respecting the mode of the Trinity in God and his operations out of himself; respecting the essence of human souls and of all spirits; and on these subjects wrangle and charge each other with heresy, and thereon

oppose or mangle the Scriptures, when we should rather acknowledge that concerning all this we can know nothing, conceive nothing! . . .

If God has revealed himself to men, how could he do it otherwise than in the speech and forms of thought belonging to the people, the region of country, and the period of time to which his voice was made known? Now it is obvious that the modes of thought and of expression are not the same in all nations, and still less in all ages. The Oriental expresses himself differently from the inhabitant of a colder clime; he has an entirely different world around him; he has gathered in his soul a treasure of entirely different conceptions; and through the training of nature around him has acquired an entirely different tendency, tone, and form of spirit from the inhabitant of the North or the West; and this difference extends throughout, from his physiognomy and dress, even unto the most subtle and hidden workings of his spirit, in the broadest manner conceivable. This point is too well known and avowed for me to enlarge upon it here.

Now this religion has been revealed in an Eastern land; how, then, could it be revealed except in a manner intelligible to Orientals, and consequently in those forms of thought prevalent among them? Otherwise God would have failed entirely in his object. Our Bible, therefore, carries upon every page of it all the traces of Oriental habits of thought. Its style, especially in the Old Testament, and for the most part in Job, the Psalms, and the Prophets, is full of lofty, bold, and fervid imagery. Even the history of creation is narrated in this elevated tone and garb; also the journeyings of the Jews through Arabia are recorded in this glowing and figurative language. Their history also and the records of their kings in Canaan, together with the writings of Solomon, all — all bear this character of Eastern floridness and picturesque drapery.

It is not well, indeed, my hearers, that we should in this way undertake to prove the divinity of our books; for on like grounds do the Turks claim the same thing for their own Koran, so poetically written. But it is still less fitting that we take occasion from this to attack or deride the divinity of our books. A little reflection will convince us that every one who wishes to be understood must adopt the style of his hearers, of his country, of his century; otherwise he becomes unintelligible. Now since

religion was first given in the East, and only after long wanderings has reached us at the North; since the mind of our country and of our time is so distinct from that; indeed, since the style of thinking and modes of expression with every nation changes almost every quarter of a century, how could it be otherwise than that many figures and modes of conception should appear strange to us, which were not so in their own time and place?

Each reflecting hearer will see how useful and necessary a thing it is even in the case of the Bible, to derive explanations and elucidations from the time and place where it was written; and that it furnishes no argument against the Bible, that it is both capable of and requires exposition. Every book coming from the olden time and from a foreign nation requires, from this very circumstance, to be explained. Accordingly, it is unreasonable to ask for a Scripture which shall be throughout equally intelligible for all individuals and nations and centuries. This can be true of no writings in the world. The most distinguished works of our time will, after two hundred years, in many respects become as strange to our descendants as those written two hundred years ago are to us. How, then, must it be with an interval of three thousand years, and with so great a remove of nations and mental characteristics? . . .

Believe me, my hearers, it is no tenet of religion to abjure thinking. It is rather its decay and the decay of humanity. Even the Apostles (and they were called by Jesus to teach) commended their hearers when they searched whether the things were so as they had said; and so would it be for me the greatest satisfaction of my calling to have awakened in you the habit of thought and reflection upon religion, and to have aided each one of you in the work of arousing his own conscience, developing more clearly his former dim experiences, training his own understanding, and in short, through my exposition of religion, rendering himself wiser, more self-acquainted, nobler, and better than he was before. In this way religion serves also for the education of our time, and that which has already so far exalted the human understanding would continue to elevate it, and with it our virtue, our humanity, our bliss. Happy times! happy world!

HILDEBERT, ARCHBISHOP OF TOURS

(*c.* 1055–1134)

ST. HILDEBERT, of Tours, poet, orator, and theologian, was born at Lavardin, near Vendôme, France, about the year 1055. He became celebrated for his sermons and for his Latin hymns, some of which still survive. The 'Tu Intrare Me Non Sinas,' generally attributed to him, is one of the most remarkable Latin lyrics of the Middle Ages. His sermon 'Rebecca at the Well,' preached at the dedication of a church, is full of the symbolism of his time, but it shows an extraordinary command of language and a faculty of expression always adequate to the thought. After serving as Bishop at Le Mans, Hildebert was made Archbishop of Tours in 1125. He died at Tours, December 18th, 1134.

REBECCA AT THE WELL

(A Sermon Preached at the Dedication of a Church)

WHAT is the cause why Isaac, the beloved son, is forbidden to take a wife of the daughters of Canaan, save that he of whom it is written, "This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased," will be espoused to no polluted soul? But the servant is commanded to take a wife for the son from his own kindred, because the holy Church of the elect was alone to be joined to the Only-Begotten Son, and that Only-Begotten from his predestination and foreknowledge did not esteem her a stranger. And who is the servant that is sent to bring home the wife, save the prophets and the apostles, and all the doctors, who, while they proclaim the word to honest hearts, become, as it were, the messengers for betrothing every Christian soul to the Only-Begotten Son? He, going forth on his journey, took with him of all the goods of his Lord, because they manifest in themselves the riches of virtue in the things which they speak concerning the Lord; and by so much the more speedily they persuade men to turn to God, by how much they set forth in themselves the things which they teach to their hearers. And

the aforesaid servant stood near the fountain and resolved, by a determination taken beforehand, which damsel he should select; because holy preachers look at the fountains of sacred writ, and collect from them what or to whom they should commit the word of their preaching, and from which auditors they may look for the certainty of faith. The servant seeks for somewhat to drink, because every preacher thirsts after the soul of his hearers. It is Rebecca who gives the water, because it is the holy Church of the elect which satisfies the desire of its preachers by the virtue of its faith; the Church which confesses the God of whom she hears, and offers to her instructor the water of refreshment, and satisfies his soul. And note that Rebecca let down the pitcher upon her hand, because that praise is well-pleasing to God which proceeds from a good work. . . . And she gave drink, not only to himself, but also to his camels, because the word of life is not only preached to the wise, but also to the foolish; according to that saying of Paul: "I am a debtor both to the wise and unwise." . . . The servant gives to Rebecca earrings and bracelets, because every preacher adorns the ears of holy Church by obedience, and her hands by the merit of good works. But the earrings are of two shekels weight, and the bracelets of ten, because the first virtue of obedience consists in love, which love is divided into two commandments, love of God and love of our neighbor; and good works are accomplished in the fulfillment of the Decalogue, so that when we begin to do that which is good, we may not allow that which is evil. Rebecca tells the servant that in her father's house there is room enough to lodge in, because holy Church shows that she has separated herself from her former people, and receives the words of the preacher in the ample bosom of her love. For the latitude of goodness in the heart of the hearer is a spacious place in which the teacher may lodge. Whence it is said to some: "Receive us; we have wronged no man, we have corrupted no man; ye are not straitened in us, but be straitened in your own bowels." As if he said openly to them: "Make the lodging of your mind wide enough to receive our doctrine; but remain straitened in your thoughts of carnal things." But in that she saith: "We have both straw and provender enough," she teaches that holy Church, hearing the word of life, repays the preachers with earthly revenue, which Paul, esteeming as it were of no account, saith: "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great matter if we shall reap your worldly

things?" Now the brother of Rebecca was Laban, who came forth in haste, and, beholding the bracelets and the rings of his sister, called the servant into the house. Because there are certain carnal men joined with the faithful who, while they behold spiritual gifts, are suspended in admiration, and, although they proceed not to works, nevertheless admit the word of preaching into their hearts so far as to believe.

For since they see that good men are often supported by miracles, they do not refuse to receive that which they hear concerning eternity; yet not following in their works the holy Church of the elect, they remain in the operation of carnal men. Laban brought forth straw, hay, water, and bread; but the servant, unless he could first gain that for which he came, namely, the marriage, refused to receive them; because there are many who are ready to retain their teachers by earthly pay; but holy preachers, unless they first gain that which concerns eternity, will have nothing to do with temporal rewards. For if they do not reap fruit from the soul, they despise the reception of pay from the body. Nor will they wash their feet, because they cannot relieve the anxiety of their longing by any consolation. But, as soon as the servant had effected the marriage of his lord, he brought forth vessels of gold, and vessels of silver, and raiment, which he gave to Rebecca; because her doctors give as many ornaments to holy Church as are the virtues which they teach. She who had before received earrings and bracelets now receives golden and silver vessels, and garments; because the Church, increasing in strength, obtains power to receive spiritual gifts; so that, filled with the spirit of prophecy and the grace of virtues, she grows rich with more ample presents. The servant gives gifts to the mother and to the brethren of Rebecca, because the Gentiles, from whom the Church comes to the faith, after her conversion, increase in temporal glory. . . . Her brothers also receive gifts, because they who, so far as words are concerned, hold the faith in the Church, but yet make not good their profession by their lives, and live carnally, are nevertheless honored by the faithful, because they themselves appear to be faithful. . . . Rebecca follows the servant with her damsels, because holy Church has with herself, as companions, souls of less merit. . . . The servant was in haste to return home, because holy preachers, when by their preaching they have gained the lives of their hearers, return thanks to him of whose gift they have

received, so that they attribute nothing in their operation to themselves, but to their Maker. At that time Isaac was walking by the way that leads to the well of him that liveth and seeth. Who is he that liveth and seeth, save the omnipotent God? Of whom it is written: "I lift up my hand to heaven and say I live forever." And again, "All things are naked and open to his eyes." But the well of him that liveth and seeth is the profundity of Holy Scripture, which Almighty God has given to us for the irrigation of our minds. And what is the way that leads to the well of him that liveth and seeth, save the humility of the passion of the Only-Begotten Son, whereby that is made manifest to us of which before the streams of Holy Scripture spake but darkly? For unless the Only-Begotten Son of God had been incarnate, tempted, betrayed, buffeted, spit upon, crucified, and had died, the profundity of this faith, that is, of the Holy Scripture, would not have been made manifest to us. For how was the humility of his passion shown to the faithful, save by the nails which opened his flesh, by which we find the well of the mysteries of God so that we may draw forth the water of knowledge from the depth? For the sacred pages of Scripture speak of his incarnation, his passion, his death, his resurrection, his ascension; and that which we know to have taken place we can now understand when we hear. These things could indeed be read before; but because as yet they had not happened, they could not be comprehended. Whence it is said by John: "The lion of the tribe of Judah hath prevailed to open the book and to loose the seals thereof." He it is that looseth its seals, who by his birth, by his death, by his resurrection, by his ascension into heaven, has manifested to us the mysteries of Holy Scripture.

Isaac went forth to meditate in the field. Now that the field signifies the world, the Lord himself explains to us, saying: "The field is the world." The Lord went forth in this, because he vouchsafed to take upon himself a visible form, as it is written: "Thou wentest forth for the salvation of thy people that thou mightest redeem thine anointed." . . . And it was at eventide when he went forth to meditate in the field, because he undertook his passion towards the end of the world; as the Psalmist speaks of his crucifixion, saying: "Let the lifting up of my hands be an evening sacrifice."

But what is signified by Rebecca's riding on the camel to Isaac, except that by Rebecca, as we have said, the Church is

signified, and by the camel on which she sat, the people of the Gentiles, deformed in their morals and loaded with idols, is set forth? . . . Rebecca, therefore, coming to Isaac, rides on the camel's back, because the Church hasting to Christ from her Gentile condition is found in the tortuous and vicious conversation of that ancient life. And when she saw Isaac, she lighted down from her camel, because holy Church the more clearly she beholds her Redeemer the more humbly she leaves off the lusts of carnal life, and sets herself to struggle against the viciousness of depraved conversation. . . . Rebecca covered herself with her veil, because the more deeply the Church penetrates into the mysteries of her Savior, the more utterly is she confounded for her past life, and blushes for what she has done perversely. . . . When the apostolic voice saith to the Church, converted from her former lofty estate, as to Rebecca descending from the camel and covering herself with a veil: What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? When Isaac brought her into the tent of his mother, she became his wife; because the Lord, in the place of the synagogue in which according to the flesh he was born, loved the holy Church and joined it to himself in love and contemplation; so that she who was before akin to him by relationship, that is, related by predestination, was afterwards joined by love and became his wife. Whom he so loved as to be comforted after his mother's death; because our Redeemer by gaining the holy Church was consoled for that grief which, perchance, he felt for the loss of the synagogue.

. . . . . .

But if we care to interpret names, Isaac signifies "laughter," Rebecca, "patience." Now laughter arises from joy, and patience comes from tribulation. And although holy Church is even now taken up by the contemplation of heavenly gladness, nevertheless she has something sorrowful to bear from the weight of mortal infirmities. But Isaac and Rebecca are joined, that is, laughter and patience are mingled together, because that is fulfilled in the Church which is written, Rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation.

BENJAMIN HARVEY HILL

(1823–1882)

BENJAMIN HARVEY HILL, leader of the Georgia opponents of Secession, and one of the most eloquent men of that State of orators, was born in Jasper County, Georgia, September 14th, 1823. He was educated at the Georgia State University, and in 1845 began the practice of law at La Grange. After serving several terms in the State legislature, he ran for Congress in 1855 on the American or "Knownothing" ticket and was defeated. He was again defeated as the American candidate for Governor in 1857, and he fared no better as a Presidential elector for Bell and Everett in 1861. He had, however, an indomitable persistence in fighting on the losing side, and in the State convention of 1861 he opposed secession at every point with his characteristic boldness. After this defeat, he served in the Confederate Congress, and as a result, being still on the losing side, he was arrested in 1865 for treason to the United States and was imprisoned at Fort Lafayette. This confirmed his popularity in Georgia, and after the State had been "reconstructed," he was elected to the forty-fourth and forty-fifth Congresses and in 1877 to the United States Senate. He died in 1882. His admirers have since erected a statue to him in Atlanta.

"A LITTLE PERSONAL HISTORY"

(From a Speech in the United States Senate, May 10th, 1879)

SIR, I want to give a little personal history, because I give it as a representative man, and it is directly upon this question. South Carolina seceded, I believe, on the twentieth of December, 1860. A convention was called by the people of Georgia to take into consideration the course that Georgia should pursue. That convention was called to meet on the sixteenth of January, 1861. The people of the county of Troup, in which I then lived, assembled *en masse* and requested me to represent them as a delegate in that convention. They made that nomination on the twenty-fifth of December, 1860, and appointed a committee to notify me of that nomination. I accepted, and, as was my duty.

avowed to them the principle on which I should act as a member of that convention, if chosen, and here is what I said in a letter then written and published:—

I will consent to the dissolution of the Union as I would consent to the death of my father, never from choice, only from necessity, and then in sorrow and sadness of heart; for, after all, the Union is not the author of our grievance. Bad, extreme men in both sections of the Union abuse and insult each other, and all take revenge by fighting the Union, which never harmed or insulted any. Perhaps it has blessed all above their merits. For myself, I will never ask from any government more real liberty and true happiness than I have enjoyed as a citizen of this great American Union. May they who destroy this Government in a frolic have wisdom to furnish our children a better.

And upon these sentiments written and published at that day, the people of that county sent me their delegate to that convention without opposition. The convention assembled the sixteenth of January, 1861. On the eighteenth of January a debate took place on a resolution asserting the right and duty of the State to secede. I had the honor of making the last speech on that occasion against the resolution. The resolution, however, was adopted just at nightfall. A committee was appointed to report an ordinance to carry the resolution into effect. The Ordinance of Secession, therefore, actually passed on the nineteenth of January, 1861, though the resolution declaring it the duty to secede was passed on the eighteenth. On the night of the nineteenth I wrote a letter to a friend, which was then published, and a copy of it I now have in my hand. That was the night of the day of Georgia's secession.

MILLEDGEVILLE, January 19th, 1861.

Dear Sir:—

The deed is done. Georgia this day left the Union. Cannon have been firing and bells tolling. At this moment people are filling the streets, shouting vociferously. A large torchlight procession is moving from house to house, and calling out speakers. The resolution declaratory passed on yesterday, and similar scenes were enacted last night. The crowd called loudly for me, but my room was dark, my heart was sad, and my tongue was silent. Whoever may be in fault is not now the question. Whether by the North or by the South, or by both, the fact remains; our Union has fallen. The most favored sons of freedom have written a page in history which despots will

read to listening subjects for centuries to come to prove that the people are not capable of self-government. How can I think thus and feel otherwise than badly?

Do not understand me as intimating a belief that we cannot form a new union on the basis of the old Constitution. We can do it and we will. This point we have secured as far as Georgia can secure it, and her will on that subject will be the pleasure of her sister seceders. But can we form one with more inspiring hopes of perpetual life than did Washington and his comrades? Despots will say no; and therefore if the first Union lived only seventy-five years, how long will this live, and the next, and still the next, until anarchy comes? It will take a hundred years of successful, peaceful free government to answer the logic of this argument against constitutional liberty.

Sir, in 1868 I had a correspondence with that great man, Horace Greeley. In my judgment he did more to build up the republican party than any other man in America. He was a great and good man, honest in his convictions and fearless in asserting them. The charge had been made that the South had sought war, that the Southern people were not to be trusted. The correspondence is published in the Tribune of that day. I beg the indulgence of the Senate while I read an extract from that correspondence. The letter is dated New York, October 2d, 1868. I will read the extract. Gentlemen can see the letter by looking at the New York Tribune of October 2d, 1868. It is to Mr. Greeley:—

Sir, let the deep sincerity of my convictions crave your indulgence for a few additional sentences. I am entitled to an audience from your readers, and through your assistance. I allude to the incident following in no spirit of reproach, but in entire kindness, and only to illustrate my point and my motive. I have seen the explanation of the Tribune, and recognize its force viewed from the standpoint of the Tribune, but our people did not then so understand it. On the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, nearly all the old Whig leaders of the South joined the democracy. This left the Whigs or Americans in a decided minority. It was then I felt it to be my duty to change the purpose of my life and enter politics.

It was my lot to engage with all my humble powers, from 1855 to 1861, in a vain effort to arrest the tide of secession that was sweeping the South, as I thought, into revolution. Late in the winter of 1860, more earnest than ever before, I warned our people that war, on the most unequal terms, must follow secession. On one of these

occasions a distinguished secession gentleman replied to my war warnings by reading extracts from prominent Northern Republicans —

I call your attention to that —

and with special emphasis from the columns of the Tribune to the effect that if the people of the South desired to secede, they had a right to do so, and would be allowed to do so in peace. He then alluded to me as one born and raised in the South, and yet was endeavoring to frighten our people from their rights by threats of war, while Northern Free-Soilers, who had been esteemed the enemies of the South, were conceding our rights and assuring its peaceful exercise. Now, my good sir, what could I have rejoined? Here are the very words I did rejoin:—

«I care not what Mr. Greeley and Mr. Wade, or any other Republican, or all Republicans together, have said or may say to the contrary. More to be relied on than all these, I plant myself on the inflexible laws of human nature, and the unvarying teachings of human experience, and warn you this day that no government half as great as this Union can be dismembered and in passion except through blood. You had as well expect the fierce lightning to rend the air and wake no thunder in its track as to expect peace to follow the throes of dissolving government. I pass by the puerile taunts at my devotion to the best interests of the people among whom I was born and reared, and trust my vindication to the realities of the future, which I deprecate and would avert, and again tell you that dissolve this Union and war will come. I do not say it ought to come. I cannot tell when, nor how, nor between whom it will come; but it will come, and it will be to you a most unequal, fierce, vindictive, and desolating war.»

I have reason to know that those words impressed Mr. Greeley. How could a Northern Free-Soiler stand up and charge infidelity to the Union when that Northern Free-Soiler, as many of them did, had told the Southern people that it was their real desire that the South should secede and they could do so in peace. But there were men all over the South who stood up in that mad hour and warned their people what would result, that these Free-Soil teachings must not be listened to.

Sir, I am reading these things to show the sentiment in the South. The Southern people did not secede from hostility to the Union, nor hostility to the Constitution, nor from any desire to be rid of the system of government under which they had lived.

The highest evidence is what is given you in the very act of secession, when they pledged themselves to form a new union upon the model of the old. The very night when I was writing

that letter and the serenading bands were in the streets, I wrote to my friends: "We will be able to effect a new union upon the model of the old," and we did form a constitution which varied not one whit in principle from the one under which we had lived.

No, sir; the South seceded because there was a war made upon what she believed to be her constitutional rights by the extreme men of the North. Those extreme men of the North were gaining absolute power in the Federal Government as the machinery by which to destroy Southern property. Then the Northern people said,—a large number of the leaders and the Republican party said that if secession was desired to be accomplished, it should be accomplished in peace. Mr. Greeley said that they wanted no union pinned together by bayonets. Here is the condition in which the South was placed: they believed the Northern extremists would use the machinery of the Government to their injury; the people of the South believed that they would protect their property by forming a new union in the South precisely upon the basis of the old. They believed they could do it in peace; and I say here there were thousands upon thousands, yea, hundreds of thousands of the best men of the South who believed that the only way to avoid a war was to secede. They believed the Northern conscience wanted to get rid of the responsibility for slavery; they believed they had a right to protect their slave property, and they thought they would accommodate the Northern conscience by leaving the Union and preserving that property. They believed they could do it in peace; and if they had believed that a war would result, they never would have seceded.

Mr. President, how was it at the North? How was it with many who are now clamoring in this country that the Southern people will not do to be trusted? I shall never forget an instance. Notwithstanding those sentiments which I have read to the Senate, the convention at Milledgeville selected me as one of the delegates to the provisional congress at Montgomery, which met, I believe, on the fourth of February, 1861. Up to that very hour those of us who believed that the interest of the South was in the Union looked to the North anxiously to avert war. We believed in our hearts that if war could be averted for a few months the Union could be restored on terms honorable to all parties. Virginia had not gone out. Virginia had a glorious

record in this country. It was the eloquent voice of her Patrick Henry which aroused the Colonies to resistance to tyranny. It was her Jefferson who framed the Declaration of Independence. It was her Madison who was the father of the Constitution under which we live. It was her Washington who conducted our armies to victory in the great struggle for liberty. It was Virginia that first made the call for the convention that framed the Constitution. No man can ever know with what gladness and hope I saw glorious old Virginia issue a request to the States of this Union in that dark hour to meet in conference and see if the peace could not be preserved and the differences adjusted between the sections.

I am not ashamed to say here, and I said there, a member of the provisional congress of the Confederate States as I was, that my heart was with that proposition, and I prayed God that it might have success. Seven States had gone out, and they could not co-operate in that peace convention. Virginia undertook the peace conference with her sister border States. I watched every movement giving hope of its success. What did we see? These very men who are now dinning the weary air with charges of infidelity upon the Southern people, who are absolutely defiling themselves with calumnies upon everything Southern, went to work to defeat the purpose of Virginia and to defeat the peaceful purposes of that movement. I shall never forget the feelings I had when I read letters from leading citizens in Washington, leading and controlling members of the Republican party, written to the governors of their States, asking them not to send delegates to that convention, and preventing its success. Here is one of the letters:—

WASHINGTON, February 11th, 1861.

My Dear Governor:—

Governor Bingham and myself telegraphed to you on Saturday, at the request of Massachusetts and New York, to send delegates to the peace or compromise congress. They admit that we were right and they were wrong; that no Republican State should have sent delegates; but they are here and cannot get away. Ohio, Indiana, and Rhode Island are caving in, and there is danger of Illinois—

"Caving in" how? Becoming willing to compromise to preserve the peace. He called that "caving in"—

and now they beg us, for God's sake, to come to their rescue and save the Republican party from rupture. I hope you will send stiff-

backed men or none. The whole thing was gotten up against my judgment —

That is, the whole conference, the peace conference —

The whole thing was gotten up against my judgment, and will end in thin smoke. Still I hope, as a matter of courtesy to some of our erring brethren, that you will send the delegates.

Truly your friend,

Z. CHANDLER.

His Excellency AUSTIN BLAIR.

He adds a postscript: —

P. S. Some of the manufacturing States think that a fight would be awful. Without a little blood-letting this Union will not, in my estimation, be worth a rush.

Sir, I was standing at the door of my hotel in Montgomery when that letter was put in my hands. I was looking to see the prospects from this peace conference. I do not wish to do anybody injustice. I do not know the gentleman who wrote that letter. It is only one of many, and it showed a purpose on the part of the Republican party to defeat all efforts at peace,—a peaceful adjustment. I said to a friend standing by me: "This is terrible; it is sad. If the leading Republicans seek to defeat the purpose of Virginia in this peace convention, it will fail; but, if war shall come, I predict now that those men who are so anxious to let blood for the Union will never let any of their own blood; they are anxious to let other people's blood." That is what I said then. I do not know whether it came true or not. Did "Z. Chandler" let any of his blood? I said more. I said: "I will venture that these men at the North who are so clamorous to defeat this peace movement will not only not go into the war, but they will seek easy places and make money during the whole time it lasts." I do not know whether any of them did it or not. I will not say they did. I am merely stating a fact of history. . . .

Now, the Senator from New York tells me that of all the loyal men on his side of the house who were clamoring at the rebels as unworthy of being trusted, men who in the terrible War of Secession were battling for the Union, only four of the whole number now on this floor were willing to save the Union by shedding their own blood. Sir, will the people look at these

things? You could not have pronounced a higher eulogy upon the Confederates in this Congress than when you showed that eighty-five out of ninety-three were willing to give their blood for what they believed to be right.

Sir, that peace conference was broken up. I put it to the Northern people who claim that they were looking to the preservation of the Union, looking to the preservation of their rights, who is most to be trusted, those men at the South who were doing all they could to avert war, or those men at the North who were doing all they could to bring it on, and then refusing to take any part in it? I know that the Republican party claim that they alone saved the Union. It is a claim of which history will judge, and it will make the claim not good. If there had been no Republican party, the Union never would have been endangered. If there had been no Republican party, there would have been no secession, no war, no reconstruction, no returning boards, and no electoral commission. It will always be an impeachment of the statesmanship of Americans that they were not wise enough and deliberate enough to dispose of the question of slavery without shedding each other's blood. If the South had respected as she ought the conscience of the North on this subject, and if the North had respected as she ought the property of the South, and there had been no obstruction from the leaders of the Republican party, there might have been a peaceful settlement of the whole controvery. Then a million of glorious, brave spirits, that are now sleeping in their graves might be living, and millions more that are widows and orphans might have husbands and fathers, and millions more who are traveling through the country houseless and naked and hungry might have raiment and shelter and plenty. . . .

Mr. President, I know I have detained the Senate long. I was born a slaveholder. That was a decree of my country's laws, not my own. I never bought a slave save at his own request; and of that I am not ashamed. I was never unkind to a slave, and all I ever owned will bear cheerful testimony to that fact. I would never deprive a human being, of any race, or color, or condition, of his right to the equal protection of the laws; and no colored man who knows me believes I would. Of all forms of cowardice, that is the meanest which would oppress the helpless, or wrong the defenseless; but I had the courage to face secession in its maddest hour and say I would not give the

American Union for African slavery, and that if slavery dared strike the Union, slavery would perish. Slavery did perish, and now in this high council of the greatest of nations, I face the leaders of State destruction and declare that this ark of our political covenant, this constitutional casket of our Confederate Nation, encasing as it does more of human liberty and human security and human hope than any government ever formed by man, I would not break for the whole African race. And cursed, thrice cursed forever be the man who would! Sir, in disunion through the disintegration of the States I have never been able to see anything but anarchy with its endless horrors. In disunion through the destruction of the States I have never been able to see anything but rigid, hopeless despotism, with all its endless oppression. In disunion by any means, in any form, for any cause, I have never been able to see anything but blood, and waste, and ruin to all races and colors and conditions of men. But in the preservation of our Union of States, this Confederate Nation, I have never been able to see anything but a grandeur and a glory such as no people ever enjoyed. I pray God that every arm that shall be raised to destroy that Union may be withered before it can strike the blow.

GEORGE FRISBIE HOAR

(1826–)

UNDER the act inviting the States to present memorial statues for the Hall of the House of Representatives at Washington, Massachusetts presented those of John Winthrop and Samuel Adams as her two most representative men. The oration delivered by Senator Hoar in making the presentation was a model of literary finish, not surpassed in this respect even by Everett's best. Senator Hoar was born at Concord, Massachusetts, August 29th, 1826. He entered national politics as a Republican Member of Congress from Massachusetts in 1869, serving in the Lower House until 1876, when he was elected to the Senate. He was a member of the Electoral Commission of 1877, and during his service in the Senate, which has been continuous since that date, he has been identified in one way or other with nearly all the most important legislation of that body. He is a man of strong individuality at once developed and restrained by a thorough education. Since the death of Charles Sumner he is, without doubt, the most efficient public speaker New England has sent to the Senate.

THE GREAT MEN OF MASSACHUSETTS

(From an Oration Delivered December 19th, 1876, on the Presentation of the Statues of John Winthrop and Samuel Adams to the United States)

Mr. Speaker:—

THE Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in obedience to the invitation of Congress, presents to the United States the statues of John Winthrop and Samuel Adams, to be placed in the old Hall of the House of Representatives, and to be kept reverently in that beautiful and stately chamber so long as its columns shall endure.

Different kinds of public service, various manifestations of intellectual and moral greatness, have been held by different nations and ages to constitute the chief title to their regard. With all her wealth in other departments of glory, England chiefly values the men who have done good fighting in her great wars.

Marlborough and Nelson and Wellington crown the stateliest columns in the squares and streets of her chief cities. When we would picture to ourselves the republics of Italy, four laureled heads of famous poets stand out upon the canvas. The statue of Erasmus, the great scholar of Holland, with a book in his hand, looks down upon the busy market place of Rotterdam. The judgment of mankind has probably determined that through the great jurists of the days of the empire, Rome has made her deepest impression on the world. The names of great soldiers, founders of nations, jurists, ministers of state, men of science, inventors, historians, poets, orators, philanthropists, reformers, teachers, are found in turn on the columns by which the gratitude of nations seeks to give immortality to their benefactors.

In deciding which of these classes should be represented or who of her children in each is worthiest of this honor, Massachusetts has not been driven to choose of her poverty. Is the choice to fall upon a soldier? Sturdy Miles Standish, earliest of the famous captains of America — "in small room large heart inclosed" — Sir William Pepperell, the conqueror of Louisburg, may vie with each other for the glory of standing by the ever-youthful and majestic figure of Warren.

Would the reverence of the nation commemorate its founders? To the State made up of the blended colonies founded by Endicott and Winthrop and the men who, on board the Mayflower, signed the first written constitution that ever existed among men, more than one-third of the people of the United States to-day trace their lineage.

No American state, no civilized nation, has contributed more illustrious names to jurisprudence than Parsons and Mason and Story and Shaw.

The long roll of her statesmen begins with those who laid the foundation of the little colony deep and strong enough for an empire. It will end when the love of liberty dies out from the soul of man. Bradford and Carver; Endicott and Winthrop; Vane, the friend of Milton and counselor of Cromwell; Otis and Samuel Adams and Quincy and Hawley, the men who conducted on the side of the people that great debate by which the Revolution was accomplished before the first gun was fired; John Adams and his son, whose biographies almost make up the history of the country for eighty years; Pickering, who filled in turn every seat in the cabinet; Webster, the greatest teacher of con-

stitutional law, save Marshall; Andrew, the great war governor; Sumner, the echoes of whose voice seem yet audible in the Senate Chamber, by no means make up the whole of the familiar catalogue.

Science will not disdain to look for fitting representatives to the State of Bowditch and John Pickering and Wyman and Pierce, and which contains the birthplace of Franklin and the home and grave of Agassiz.

Are we to hold with Franklin that the world owes more to great inventors than to all its warriors and statesmen? The inventor of the cotton gin, who doubled the value of every acre of cotton-producing land in the South; the inventor of the telegraph, at whose obsequies the sorrow of all nations throbbing simultaneously around the globe was manifested; the discoverer of the uses of ether in surgery, who has disarmed sickness of half its pain and death of half its terrors, may dispute with each other a palm for which there will be no other competitors.

Among historians the names of Bancroft and Sparks and Motley and Prescott and Palfrey and Parkman will endure till the deeds they celebrate are forgotten. "Worthy deeds," said John Milton, "are not often destitute of worthy relators, as by a certain fate great acts and great eloquence have commonly gone hand in hand."

"Native to famous wits
And hospitable, in her sweet recess,"

Massachusetts contributes to the list of poets who have delighted the world the names of Bryant and Emerson and Whittier and Longfellow and Lowell and Holmes.

Among the foremost of Americans in oratory, that foremost of arts, stand Quincy, the Cicero of the Revolution; Otis, that "flame of fire"; the persuasive Choate, the silver-tongued Everett, the majestic Webster.

Of the great lovers of their race, whose pure fame is gained by unselfish devotion of their lives to lessening suffering or reforming vice, Massachusetts has furnished conspicuous examples. Among these great benefactors who have now gone to their reward, it is hard to determine the palm of excellence. To the labors of Horace Mann is due the excellence of the common schools in America, without which liberty must perish, despite of constitution or statute.

If an archangel should come down from heaven among men, I cannot conceive that he could give utterance to a loftier virtue or clothe his message in more fitting phrase than are found in the pure eloquence in which Channing arraigned slavery, that giant crime of all ages, before the bar of public opinion, and held up the selfish ambition of Napoleon to the condemnation of mankind. "Never before," says the eulogist of Channing, "in the name of humanity and freedom, was grand offender arraigned by such a voice. The sentence of degradation which Channing has passed, confirmed by coming generations, will darken the fame of the warrior more than any defeat of his arms, or compelled abdication of his power."

Doctor Howe, whose youthful service in the war for the independence of Greece, recalling the stories of knight-errantry, has endeared his name to two hemispheres, is yet better known by what he has done for those unfortunate classes of our fellow-men whom God has deprived of intellect or of sense. He gave eyes to the fingers of the blind, he taught the deaf and dumb articulate speech, waked the slumbering intellect in the darkened soul of the idiot, brought comfort, quiet, hope, courage, to the wretched cell of the insane.

To each of these the people of Massachusetts have, in their own way, paid their tribute of honor and reverence. The statue of Horace Mann stands by the portal of the Statehouse. The muse of Whittier and Holmes, the lips of our most distinguished living orators, the genius of his gifted wife, have united in a worthy memorial of Howe. The stately eloquence of Sumner, in his great oration at Cambridge, has built a monument to Channing more enduring than marble or granite, but Channing's published writings, eagerly read wherever the English language prevails, are better than any monument.

Yet I believe Channing and Howe and Mann, were they living to-day, would themselves yield precedence to the constant and courageous heroism of him who said: "I am in earnest; I will not equivocate; I will not retreat a single inch; and I will be heard"; whose fame

> "Over his living head, like heaven is bent
> An early and eternal monument."

The act of Congress limits the selection to deceased persons, not exceeding two in number for each State. Massachusetts has

chosen those who, while they seemed the fittest representatives of what is peculiar in her own character and history, have impressed that character on important public events which have been benefits to the nation at large. . . .

That peculiarity is what is called Puritanism. To that principle, which I will try to define presently, I think it would not be difficult to trace nearly everything which Massachusetts has been able to achieve in any department of excellence. But it has a direct national importance in three conspicuous eras. One of them is too recent to allow of dispassionate consideration. The others are the eras of the foundation of the State and of the American Revolution. . . .

And so, Mr. Speaker, it has come to pass that in the centennial year Massachusetts brings the first and the last of her great Puritans to represent her in the nation's gallery of heroes and patriots. Two hundred and forty-six years have gone by since John Winthrop landed at Salem. It is a hundred years since Samuel Adams set his name at Philadelphia to the charter of that independence which it had been the great purpose of his life to accomplish. Their characters, public and private, have been the subject of an intense historic scrutiny, both hostile and friendly. But the State, not, we hope, having failed to learn whatever new lessons these centuries have brought, still adopts them as the best she has to offer.

I do not use the word Puritan in a restricted sense. I do not mean the bigots or zealots who were the caricature of their generation. I do not discuss the place in history of the men of the English commonwealth. Whether the hypocritical buffoon of Hudibras or the religious enthusiast of Macaulay be the fit type of that generation of Englishmen before whom Europe trembled, we do not need to inquire. I use the word in a large sense, as comprehending the men who led the emigration, made up the bulk of the numbers, established the institutions of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Plymouth, and administered their affairs as self-governing republics in all but name for more than a century and a half.

Through the vast spaces of human history there have resounded but a few heroic strains. Unless the judgment of those writers who have best conceived and pictured heroism — Milton, Burke, Carlyle, Froude — be at fault, among these there has been none loftier than the Puritanism of New England. The impress

which a man makes upon mankind depends upon what he believes, what he loves, what are his qualities of intellect and of temper. You must consider all these to form a just estimate of the great generations with which we are dealing. The Puritan loved liberty, religious and civil; he loved home and family and friends and country with a love never surpassed, and he loved God. He did not love pleasure or luxury or mirth. He dwelt with the delight of absolute certainty on the anticipation of a life beyond the grave. His intellect was fit for exact ethical discussion, clear in seeing general truths, active, unresting, fond of inquiry and debate, but penetrated and restrained by a shrewd common sense. He saw with absolute clearness the true boundary which separates liberty and authority in the State. He had a genius for making constitutions and statutes. He had a tenacity of purpose, a lofty and inflexible courage, an unbending will, which never quailed or flinched before human antagonist, or before exile, torture, or death. The Puritan was a thorough gentleman, of dignified, noble, stately bearing, as becomes men who bear weighty responsibilities, deal with the greatest interests, and meditate on the loftiest themes. Read John Winthrop's definition of civil liberty or his reasons for settling in New England, and judge of the temper of those men, who, of free choice, made him twelve times their Governor.

The Puritan believed that the law of God is the rule of life for States as for men. He believed in the independence of the individual conscience and in self-government according to the precedents of English liberty, because he believed that both were according to the will of God. "It is the glory of the British Constitution," said Samuel Adams, "that it hath its foundation in the law of God." "The magistrate is the servant," said John Adams, "not of his own desires, not even of the people, but of his God." He derived the knowledge of that will from a literal interpretation of Scripture, which he thought furnished precepts or examples for every occasion. Yet it is wonderful how soon the common sense of the Puritan wrought out the principles of sound administration, and freed him from the errors into which other men fell. He interpreted literally the divine command: "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." Yet the witchcraft delusion, disgrace of all Christian nations, never reached Plymouth or Connecticut, and touched Massachusetts but lightly. In England, from 1600 to 1680, forty thousand persons were put to

death as witches, and in Scotland nearly as many. On the continent of Europe the victims were numbered by hundreds of thousands. In Massachusetts the number never reached a score. The little Swiss city of Geneva put to death five hundred persons for this crime in a single year. A child nine years old was executed for witchcraft in Huntingdon, England, in 1719. The laws against witchcraft remained in force in England till 1736, and in Scotland till 1738, fifty years after the time when, first of all mankind, Massachusetts repented of the delusion, the opinion of her whole people being uttered in the ever-memorable confession of Sewall, the Puritan chief-justice. They had sacrificed almost everything else that man values to enjoy the worship of God after their own fashion. Yet they were among the first of mankind to establish complete religious toleration. I have heard the Puritans of New England taunted for religious bigotry by the representatives of States which, as late as 1741, put men to death for the crime of being Catholics.

The Puritan believed in a future life, where just men were to enjoy immortality with those whom they had loved here; and this belief was his comfort and support in all the sorrow and suffering which he encountered. But he believed also in the coming of God's kingdom here. He had a firm faith that the State he had builded was to continue and grow, a community of men living together in the practice of virtue, in the worship of God, in the pursuit of truth. It has been said of each of two great Puritan leaders: "Hope shone like a fiery pillar in him when it had gone out in all others. His mind is firmly fixed on the future; his face is radiant with the sunrise he intently watches."

Lastly, the Puritan believed in the law of righteous retribution in the affairs of nations. No departure from God's law of absolute justice, of absolute honesty, of absolute righteousness, could escape, so it seemed to him, its certain and terrible punishment. The oppressor who deprived the poorest or weakest of mankind of the equal right with which God had endowed him, the promise-breaker who juggled with public obligation, the man who gained power by violence or fraud, brought down, as he believed, the vengeance of God upon himself and upon his children, and upon the nation which permitted him, to the third and fourth generation.

Mr. Speaker, the State that the Puritan planted has opened her gates to men of other lineage and of other creed. It may be

that in the coming centuries his descendants are to yield to another race the dominion of his beloved New England, and that only in gentler climes and on the shores of a more pacific sea men will delight to remember that their fathers were of the company of Winthrop, or sat in council with Adams. But the title of the Puritan to remembrance will not depend upon locality. In that mightier national life, drawn from so many sources — of many, one; of many States, one nation; of many races, one people; of many creeds, one faith — the elements he has contributed are elements of perpetual power: his courage; his constancy; his belief in God; his reverence for law; his love of liberty; his serene and lofty hope.

SIR ROBERT HOLBORNE

(*c.* 1594–1647)

SIR ROBERT HOLBORNE, whose claim to immortality rests on his service as attorney for John Hampden in resistance to the unlawfully levied tax of "Ship-Money," was the son of Sir Nicholas Holborne, of Chichester. He represented Southwark in the Short Parliament of 1640, and served for a time in the Long Parliament, in which, however, he did not distinguish himself, except by his endeavors to prevent the attainder of Strafford. This separated him from his party, and he finally joined the King at Oxford. Under royal favor he became Attorney-General to the Prince of Wales and received the honor of knighthood. He died in 1647, leaving a considerable number of works on law which might have been forgotten wholly but for his defense of Hampden.

His speech for Hampden was at all times a summing up of authorities rather than a discussion of principles.

IN DEFENSE OF JOHN HAMPDEN

(From the Argument on Behalf of Hampden, in 1637, before the Judges in the Exchequer Chamber, in the Great Case of Ship-Money)

My Lords:—

I have gone over in a general way, as well as I can, and endeavored to answer the practice; to have gone over all in particular would have required longer time than your lordships can spare.

The reasons now only rest to be examined; for if no full authority, nor sufficient practice, reason alone will not argue against a fundamental rule: for we are not now to examine on reason what is fit, and what not, but to see what is the truth.

The first is, *salus populi suprema lex!* The question is not what we are to do by necessity, but what is the positive law of the land. The question must now be as before; what power is in the king, and what did our forefathers in that time of peace and government leave in the crown, not in case of necessity and

public danger; when, with them, *salus populi* was *suprema lex*, and upon that they did ground the rule of government? In this case, whether or no, in their consideration, they did conceive for the public good, to leave the power in the king or not, to lay a charge on the people; there the rule came in, *salus reipublicæ suprema lex:* and that which they looked on most was the benefit of the multitude. So that now, my lords, it is not to dispute whether it be better or worse, but that it was. And to show there was no such great necessity as can countervail the possibility of prejudice the other way; if there do come such a danger, then the subject is at that time under a law of preservation of life; and all which makes the subject as willing to obey as to submit to government in the creation. This law is of a higher force than any positive law can be. But admit that this should cease in this case, and all positive laws of property yield to the law of necessity; yet I admit nothing, though I might admit much, and not prejudice the case.

Though no positive law doth charge it, yet in case of imminent danger, if I should say my private property is become public, it is no mischief, for so it is in some cases; for in this time of imminent danger, the king and subjects are under a law of absolute necessity and public safety. In all human reason, when the danger is *in proxima potentia*, we may prevent it; thus if another man's house be on fire, mine may be pulled down to stop it: so that we may see by what grounds we do go in case of absolute necessity. If the king doth command anything concerning the property of goods, in respect of danger, the execution may not be by any positive law merely, which in such cases do cease *in furore belli;* for those are acted by formalities, and *inter arma silent leges.* And in these cases, as the king may command my property, so may the subject command the property of another. The books are so (8th Ed. 4). For hindering the landing of an enemy, bulwarks may be built on my land without consent. So the power is not only in the king in these cases of necessity, but in the subject: and the books say not that the power is only in the king, but I can do it, and the law of necessity is the warrant.

Then, my lords, it resteth considerable in this case, what shall be said to be a time of necessity? I speak still by way of admittance, for I grant nothing. It must be in a danger now acting or *in proxima potentia;* as fire, though not burning, yet

ready to burn: that is, there must be a war, *furor belli.* Note that when the king makes proclamation of war, or the king is in the field; and that, indeed, was not Mr. St. John's meaning, it was taken further than he meant it.

It must be in such a danger, when this power is of necessity to be used, as in case of fire; there must not only be fear of fire, for one house must be first actually on fire, before the house can be pulled down, but withal such a danger, that if this be not pulled down, the other will be lost; and as in case of an enemy, a subject, out of fear of an enemy, cannot build a bulwark on another man's land, but when he is a-coming. So that none of these cases will match ours. The property yieldeth not in fear of danger; but such a danger as help must come in *nunc aut nunquam.* This time is not when the king will think there is occasion to exert this power, as in the case of 1588. Though the queen and State did command the burning of those goods and provisions, if an enemy landed (which was a lawful command, and justifiable to be done); so they did land; but could not command them to burn their corn before an enemy did come.

Your lordships know the king may command in case of danger the destruction of all suburbs, rather than an enemy should come in them. But if there be a fear only of wars, if the king should command it, how far that is justifiable I leave it to your lordships' judgment. All this difference appears out of the case of the Gravesend barge. (Duffield's case, 12 Jac.) If there be a storm, or a leak in a ship, that the danger be actual, it is justifiable for the master to throw out the goods; but if he see a cloud arise, and out of fear of a storm he throw out the goods, I doubt on a jury which way this will go with the bargeman; but if a storm do come, or a leak spring, in that case the bargeman may do it. So you see upon what law my property yieldeth. That position generally taken, as it is said, may be of a great deal of consequence; for it doth not rest there, solely upon yielding of the laws of property: for all positive laws do cease in that danger; then the positive laws of my liberty and person also do cease.

Now, whether or no you conceive all laws of liberty and person to cease in this time of danger, when the danger was but conceived and not actual,— that I leave to your lordships' judgment. And if that rule be general, then why not the other? So we may see the difference from our case; for in that case

there is no manner of loss to the subject, for he shall have allowance for his loss, or make suit to the Parliament, and they can recompense him; for what is taken for the public good is borrowed. As in the case of shipping, if my goods be cast out to save the ship, every one of the ship is to bear a share; so in our case, either the king must do it, or the Parliament: so there is no prejudice.

So upon the whole, my answer is: Admit the rule of *salus populi suprema lex;* yet the law of practice doth not yield till there be an actual enemy, or *flagrans bellum.* It is not enough that there be but an apprehension.

There were divers other reasons urged, but those two of *salus populi suprema lex*, and of private property must yield to public safety, were the two *rationes cogentes;* the other were but *a pari et a simili;* and all those I shall pass over which were only for convenience, as the granting of toll, or a corporation to make ordinance for the good of the corporation; all these will not come home in the manner. My lords, in all these cases, *a minore ad majus non valet; negativum valet.*

But there are only two reasons urged which require an answer. The trust that the laws put in the king in greater matters, namely, the shutting of the ports, and the Droit Royal of wars and peace. For the shutting of the ports there is more difference in point of prejudice of the king than the subject. The king cannot shut the ports but to his own prejudice. Again, the shutting of the ports without cause of necessity, the king hath the loss as well as we; for by that he loseth his customs, and by shutting them he can gain nothing at all. And, besides, there is no law at all that hinders him from that. But there is a law saith that he shall not tax the subject without consent in Parliament.

The next is the Droit Royal of wars and peace. It is one thing to say the king can make war and peace, another thing to say he can charge. In war and peace the king is equally charged with the subject, and nay more; and for those things there are no great reasons, but that in the first form of government they might be well suffered. For that cause touching the king's power over coinage, there was a necessity to counterpoise the like thing in another State; in that case the king loseth, and we lose. The king may dispense with penal statutes and make them as none. Doth any law say he shall not do it? The

reason differeth in that case; there is a common necessity that there should be a power in somebody, for acts of Parliament are but *leges temporis*. It is one thing for the king to have power in point of favor, and another thing in point of charge; so in case of pardon there is no hurt if he doth pardon: God forbid that he should not have power to show mercy.

My lords, there are in the case two points more which I shall move. Whether or not, admitting that the king could command the subjects to find ships, he can give power to the sheriffs to make the assessment as in the writ, the ground is upon this, that in all cases of politic charges the law takes an especial care to make an equality. In Parliaments of old they were always careful to make provision that way, as upon fifteenths and subsidies. And in Danegelt they went such a way as there could be no inequality; they went by "taxing the hides." Now if the law doth make this a legal way of charging, it allows the like way for assessment that is allowed in other cases, such as a way as wherein there can be no inconveniency. Now how a sheriff hath that knowledge to lay it on men's estates and lands I cannot tell.

My lords, is it well not to leave the power in the king to lay an arbitrary charge, but in the sheriff to lay more or less on any man? Though the law may trust the king, yet it is a question whether it will trust the sheriff. Nay, I ask if the sheriff be an officer of law in this case, yet the king may command any man as well. Assessments are usually made by others, and not so much by the sheriff. So I do conceive that this is a thing that doth properly belong not to the sheriff; he is not an officer sworn, and it resteth not only in the sheriff but the under-sheriff. So that if the law doth trust the king, yet whether or no this be the way to charge it, I leave it to your lordships' judgment. If a hundred be charged, they have ways to lay it on themselves proportionately.

The next thing is this: admit a levy may be well made, whether the money thus paid may be brought into the exchequer by a *Sci. fa.* I do think that this is the first writ that ever was of this kind; I do not find it regularly.

My lords, I think it is hard to find where there is a writ that commands and prescribes the manner of levy. It not only gives you power to levy, but sets the way of levying, by imposition, by distress, by selling; for my part I know no case can match it.

SAMUEL HOUSTON

(1793–1863)

SAMUEL HOUSTON, one of the most picturesque characters in American history, was born near Lexington, Virginia, March 2d, 1793. While he was still a boy, his parents removed to East Tennessee, then in the heart of the "Indian country." Houston's education was derived largely from Pope's 'Homer' and association with the Cherokees. In after life he was an extensive, if not a methodical reader, but he never outgrew the effects of this early training—a training which appears in his speeches as it did when, with an old sword tied around his hunting shirt by a buckskin thong, he put himself at the head of the Texan army and worsted Santa Anna, "The Napoleon of the West," at San Jacinto. Houston entered Tennessee politics as a *protégé* of Andrew Jackson, through whose influence, and his own marked ability as a stump speaker, he became a Member of Congress in 1823, and Governor of the State in 1827. Soon after his marriage with a young and beautiful woman, for whom he always professed the deepest respect, he resigned his office, left his wife, mounted his horse, and rode out of the State into the Indian Territory, where he lived with his old friends, the Cherokees, adopting their tribal habits and seemingly lost to civilization until the Texas war of independence called him to the command of the armies of that struggling republic. He was President of Texas from 1836 to 1838 and from 1841 to 1844. After the annexation of the State, he served in the United States Senate from 1845 to 1859, and as Governor of Texas from 1859 to 1861. He was bitterly opposed to secession, and fought it as hard as he had fought the Mexicans, continuing his aggressive opposition until Civil War had actually begun. His speech at the bar of the House in 1832, one of the most characteristic of his recorded speeches, was occasioned by his arrest for assaulting Congressman Stanberry, of Ohio, who, on the floor of the House and in a newspaper publication, had made references to him which he construed as an impeachment of his honesty. Meeting Stanberry soon afterwards, Houston struck him several times with a cane. On his arrest, by the House, for assaulting one of its Members, he made his defense at the bar in a characteristic style. His references to the "plowshare of ruin" are explained by the fact that at the time the speech was made, he was still virtually a member of the Cherokee

tribe, "an exile," undecided whether or not he would have a future in civilized life. He died July 25th, 1863, honored then and now by all Texans, in spite of differences of opinion, as the greatest man of the State and one of the greatest of the country.

ON HIS DEFEAT AS A UNION CANDIDATE

(From a Speech in the United States Senate, March 19th, 1858, Replying to Clement C. Clay, of Alabama)

SIR, I protest against gentlemen speaking of "my State," or "my section." I have heard it long enough. I will have none of it. I am a Southern man; and no one has ever raised his arm or bared his breast to give wider extension to its territory, or to vindicate its rights, more than I have done; and I am always ready to do it; but I have no war of words to bandy; I have no agitation to foster. Sir, I have heard too much in the councils of the nation about sections. I know none of your sections. The State from which I come was united to the American Union and confederated with sister States, but she did not come in as a sectional appendage. I want to feel that this is a confederated community and nation, and that it must be preserved. Let us resolve to preserve the Union, and bestow the same pains, care, investigation, and research to give cement and stability to that Union that are now bestowed to create faction and discord, and we shall accomplish a work worthy of gods to contemplate. But factious proceedings are unworthy of men, unworthy of Senators, unworthy of patriots. I have not acted for a section. I will know no section. I am not going to encourage the fell spirit of discord; and when I can interpose an objection of mine to its progress, I will arrest it at the peril of my life.

I wish it to be distinctly understood that there are more people in the South than the statesmen and politicians who are seen in her public assemblages. There is a gallant yeomanry, a chivalrous and generous population, whose hardy hands are adapted as well to toiling for the procurement of the necessaries of life and the nurture of their families as they are to the application of arms to vindicate their rights. They are the men whose voice will be heard when you carry the question of union or disunion to their homes in their peaceful cabins, with their little yards surrounded by their domestic animals, and all those things which

are endeared to them. Then they will speak of the Union, and they will think of it; and when they contemplate the comforts which they have, and know how uncertain these would be if they were to cast all to the issue of anarchy, they will stand by the Union.

Mr. President, I said that I would not take up the time of the Senate, nor have I any disposition to do so; but I do say that was the best act of my life. My life has been a long and varied one. The only achievement that failed and brought sorrow to my heart was that I could not defeat that fatal measure [the Kansas-Nebraska Bill] which was fostered by demagogues, originated in ambition, was intended for no valuable interest of the country, but to unite the South, and, with a few scattering Northern States, make a President, and continue the succession. That was the iniquity of it. I said then that the oldest man living at that time might say he had seen the commencement of trouble, but the youngest child then born would not see the end of the calamities which would result to the South from that measure, if adopted. It has been adopted, and what has been the result? That is a subject on which I have nothing to say. My actions may speak of what I think of it; but I do not desire any misapprehension of my motives or my conduct to be entertained. Whenever a gentleman presents himself who has given stronger assurance of patriotic devotion to his country than I have done to the Union and the Constitution and to every section, then I will defer to him, and hear a rebuke for the sentiments which have been nourished and cherished in my heart while living, and will be buried with me unless they ascend to a higher destiny. . . .

Mr. President, I am opposed to the extremely improper sentiments uttered in the North, as I am in the South. I am opposed to both extremes; I favor neither. There is a middle ground; and there we shall find rectitude and propriety, and all that is desirable. It was not the gentleman personally [Clement C. Clay] that I wished to rebuke. I referred to his sentiments. Since he has made allusion to my State, I will say a word on that point. I grant him very truthfully that I have received an earnest and gratifying assurance from my constituents that they intend to relieve me from further service here. I say gratifying, for in the recent election they beat me; and it is gratifying, as I had every disposition to retire on the fourth day of March next from public

life. How it was brought about I cannot exactly tell. I know that I had a chevalier and ex-President mounted with boots, spurs, and whip, and a hind rider from Illinois, both after me ever since I voted against the Kansas-Nebraska Bill; and that was enough to break down an old gray horse. [Laughter.] Besides, all the Federal influence was marshaled, drilled, and prepared for the combat, and I was defeated. I am very much obliged to my State because they have not disowned me in beating me — they have only preferred another. I have this further assurance that I made the State, but I did not make the people; and if they do wrong, the State still remains in all its beauty, with its splendid and inviting prospects, with nothing on the earth to surpass it in climate, soil, and productions, all varied and delightful. It remains the same beautiful Texas. I made it. I did not make the people. They came there, and they are there; but the State remains, and I am a citizen of it.

The gentleman says he loves Alabama because he was born there. Sir, I, too, love Alabama; I have endearments of the most delicate character connected with Alabama. More, sir, when it was an unbroken wilderness forty-four years ago, when the savage and the wild beast roamed over it, and every man who went there had to go with his life in one hand and his weapons of war in the other; it was there that I kindled camp-fires and sat by them and kept vigils. I assisted in redeeming that land from a wilderness and a desert, and I watered it with the richest blood of youth that flowed in these veins. Ought I not to love the South? Yes, sir; I cherish every manly sentiment for the South, and I am determined that while I live in it none of the fraternal bonds which bind it to this Union shall be broken.

HIS DEFENSE AT THE BAR OF THE HOUSE

(Delivered May 7th, 1832, before the House of Representatives)

Mr. Speaker:—

ARRAIGNED for the first time in my life, on a charge of violating the laws of my country, I feel all that embarrassment which my peculiar situation is calculated to inspire. Though I have been defended by able and enlightened counsel, possessing intellect of the very highest order, embellished, too, by all

that science and literature can bestow, yet it seems proper that, under such circumstances, I should be heard in my own vindication.

The charge which has been preferred against me is one of no ordinary character. If I shall be convicted of having acted from the motive alleged by my accuser, lasting infamy must be the necessary consequence.

To my apprehension, the darkest dungeons of this Government, with all the pains and penalties of treason, present a trifling consideration when compared with that load of infamy which, under such circumstances, must attach itself forever to my name.

What is the nature of the charge? I am accused of lying in wait, for the purpose of depriving a fellow-man of the efficient use of his person, if not of existence itself. Sir, can there be a greater crime? Who but a wretch unworthy of the name of man could ever be guilty of it? I disclaim utterly every motive unworthy of an honorable man. If, when deeply wronged, I have followed the generous impulse of my heart, and have thus violated the laws of my country, or trespassed on the prerogatives of this honorable body, I am willing to be held to my responsibility for so doing. No man has more respect for this body and its rights and privileges. Never can I forget the associations connected with this Hall. Never can I lose the remembrance of that pride of heart which swelled my bosom when finding myself, for the first time, enjoying those privileges, and exercising those rights, as one of the representatives of the American people. Whatever may have been the political collisions in which I was occasionally involved, whatever diversity of feelings may have for a moment separated me from some of my associates, they have never been able to take away that respect for the collective body which I have ever proudly cherished. The personal associations I have enjoyed with many of those I now see around me, I shall ever remember with the kindest feelings. None of these things, however, are to operate as the smallest extenuation of my offense that shall be proved against me. All I demand is that my actions may be pursued to the motives which gave them birth. Though it may have been alleged that I am "a man of broken fortune and blasted reputation," I never can forget that reputation, however limited, is the high boon of heaven. Perhaps the circumstances of adversity,

by which I have been crushed, have made me cling to the little remains of it which I still possess, and to cherish them with the greater fondness.

Though the plowshare of ruin has been driven over me, and laid waste my brightest hopes, yet I am proud to think that, under all circumstances, I have endeavored to sustain the laws of my country, and to support her institutions. Whatever may be the opinions of gentlemen in relation to these matters, I am here to be tried for a substantive offense, disconnected entirely with my former life or circumstances. I have only to say to those who rebuke me, at the time when they see adversity sorely pressing upon me, for myself—

> "I seek no sympathies nor need:
> The thorns which I have reaped are of the tree
> I planted; they have torn me, and I bleed."

In support of the charge on which I am here arraigned, I ask what facts have been adduced to prove either my motive or my course of action? I am well aware that this honorable body, in the incipient stages of this prosecution, acted under the allegation that I had been guilty of a very great outrage—that I had been lying in wait, and had been guilty of an attack upon an unarmed and helpless man.

Sir, had I contemplated any such attack, I should have been prepared for the purpose. Had I thought it possible that, in walking on that avenue, I was to meet an individual who had aught against me, and was disposed to redress the wrong by a personal rencontre, should I have been found in the circumstances in which I was? Was I armed? Was I lying in wait? What says the testimony? My meeting with the Member from Ohio was perfectly accidental. We came together wholly unexpectedly on my part, and under circumstances of provocation such as I am well persuaded no member of this body would ever brook. Did I attack him without previous challenge? No. Did I not apprise him that I was the individual he had injured? He had ample time to place his hand upon his arms, which he did! I was unarmed. Sir, has this the semblance of assassination?

. . . . . .

In a court of justice I had ever been taught to believe that the person of an individual accused, whatever might have been his alleged offense, was held to be under protection; that he was

shielded by the dignity and authority of the tribunal from obloquy and abuse, and protected from all violence, whether by speech or action. It is admitted that counsel may animadvert with severity upon his conduct, and enlarge upon his guilt. But there is a decorum which usually governs the style of a prosecutor, however so much heated he may be by his subject. The power of public opinion, if nothing else, is sufficient to restrain him, and to correct all impropriety of language. He has reason to fear the correction of an indignant people whenever he is tempted to heap insult upon those in bonds. But while standing at this bar, have I not been branded with the epithet of assassin? And have I not brooked it? Will the annals of judicial proceeding exhibit another instance where such language has been permitted to be applied to an individual in custody? Yet, before the eyes of this assembly, and in the eyes of this whole nation, have I been traduced by the epithet of assassin. Sir, I trust that I need not disclaim the crime imputed in that word. I bore no dagger when I met my accuser! When that term was applied to me in this place and on this occasion, I do confess that I felt my spirit chafe, and feelings indignant. But so far as the muscles of my countenance were capable of suppressing every indication of such a feeling, I did suppress it. Yet I could not but think of the eloquent and impressive rebuke administered to the high priest of the Jews by the Apostle Paul, when he stood in bonds before him, and the high priest ordered him to be smote upon the mouth. "God shall smite thee, thou whited wall, for sittest thou to judge me according to the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law?" When I was on my trial at this bar, I was under the protection of this august tribunal. I had by my deportment here provoked no indignity. As an American citizen I had a claim to that impunity from insult which is accorded to the veriest victim of malice. Yet I was stigmatized as an assassin, and I brooked it, uttering no reproach in reply. I hoped it might be a propitiation of the offense, if I had committed any against the privileges of the American people.

As for the feelings which prompted my accuser who made use of the term, however warranted he may have supposed himself in applying it to me, I can refer him to the time, and I do it with pride, though not in the spirit of vaunting, when it was my destiny, and I felt it, I confess, a high and honorable destiny to be the representative on this floor of American freemen.

Did the gentleman at that time see anything in my deportment which would warrant his treating me as he has done? And I think it must be accorded to me that when, since that time, I have been accidentally present here, my deportment has been ever respectful. It has never been my habit to retain and gratify malignant feelings; nor should I have given occasion for the present proceedings had I not been accused, denounced, and insulted upon this floor. I do not justify my course. I have been held accountable and I have accounted for it. But I trust this is not to be made a precedent for others. If in what I did I sinned against this honorable House, I was unconscious of the fact. The sin existed not in my intention; it had no place in my heart. If others now enjoying the high station I once possessed think it becoming to assail me with contempt, ridicule, and vituperation, I trust I have the fortitude to endure it. I cannot forget that while I have my privileges others have their privileges also and must account for their improper exercise.

I may have erred when proceeding on the principle of other analogous cases. I objected to the judgment of a prejudiced and committed judge. If I had made an assassin-like attack upon the reputation of an accused man, I would at least have held myself aloof from the task of pronouncing judgment upon him. Sir, I feel that I never could have done it. Could I have been guilty of such an act? Could I so far have lost sight of every high object, of every noble purpose, of every sacred trust, I should have incurred a doom so degraded that imagination itself would fail in the pursuit of my destiny, and fancy would become weary in the pursuit of a profitless journey. I should have sunk myself so low that Archimedes himself, with all the fancied power of his levers, though employed at the task for a thousand years, could never have exalted such a spirit to the rank and circumstances of honorable men. Whatever epithets it may have pleased gentlemen to use, I acquit them of reproach. I have no epithets to return. I will not cherish for a moment an unkind feeling — no, not for "the unkindest cut of all."

Sir, even if injury has been done to the privileges of this House, which I deny, does it not become the House to consider whether, in correcting one wrong, another may not spring up of far greater and overshadowing magnitude? In the discussion which preceded my arrest, my character was gratuitously and wantonly assailed. It was suggested, as an argument for the arrest,

that I had probably fled like a ruffian, a renegade, and a blackguard; and that minutes might be of vast importance.

To these gentlemen who could advance such an opinion, I say that they knew little about me. I never avoided responsibility. I have periled some little in the protection of American citizens, and if I, myself an American citizen, have periled life and blood to protect the hearths of my fellow-citizens, they little know me who would imagine that I would flee from the charge of crime that was imputed to me. At all events, they will learn that for once I have not proved recreant. I have not eschewed responsibility — I have not sought refuge in flight. Never! never! shall that brand attach itself to my name. Would it not have been strange that I should seek to dishonor my country through her representatives, when I have ever been found ready, at her call, to do and suffer in her service? Yes. And I trust that while living upon this earth I shall ever be found ready, at her call, to vindicate the wrongs inflicted upon her in collective capacity, or upon her citizens in their personal rights, and to resent my own personal wrongs. Whatever gentlemen may have imagined, so long as that proud emblem of my country's liberties, with its stripes and its stars (pointing to the American flag over the portrait of Lafayette) shall wave in this hall of American legislators, so long shall it cast its sacred protection over the personal rights of every American citizen. Sir, when you shall have destroyed the pride of American character, you will have destroyed the brightest jewel that heaven ever made. You will have drained the purest and the holiest drop which visits the heart of your sages in council, and your heroes in the field. You will have annihilated the principle that must sustain that emblem of the nation's glory, and elevate that emblem above your own exalted seat. These massy columns, with yonder lofty dome, shall sink into one crumbling ruin. Yes, sir, though corruption may have done something, and luxury may have added her seductive powers in endangering the perpetuity of our nation's fair fame, it is these privileges which still induce every American citizen to cling to the institutions of his country, and to look to the assembled representatives of his native land as their best and only safeguard.

But, sir, so long as that flag shall bear aloft its glittering stars — bearing them amidst the din of battle, and waving them

triumphantly above the storms of the ocean, so long, I trust, shall the rights of American citizens be preserved safe and unimpaired, and transmitted as a sacred legacy from one generation to another, till discord shall wreck the spheres, the grand march of time shall cease, and not one fragment of all creation be left to chafe on the bosom of eternity's waves.

THOMAS HUGHES

(1823–1896)

AS THE author of 'Tom Brown at Rugby,' the most thoroughly genuine boy's book since 'Robinson Crusoe,' Thomas Hughes is known and loved wherever the English language is spoken. In such addresses as that delivered at Clifton College in 1879, he showed the same mental and moral traits which have made him so popular as an author. He was candid in thought, earnestly desirous of helping others rather than of exploiting himself, and both in his ideas and his eloquent expression of them, full of the grace of beneficent activity of intellect. He was born near Newbury in Berkshire, England, October 23d, 1823. Educated in many ways and at many places, he received his intellectual bent at Rugby from Doctor Arnold. He has honored his master, not only in 'Tom Brown at Rugby,' but in his Colony at Rugby, Tennessee, and in his work done in association with Canon Kingsley to uplift the English masses. He died March 22d, 1896.

As a public speaker, he represents the best tradition of the English platform. He is strong, terse, and full of the force of his own belief in the power of goodness and of truth. Every word he says means something.

THE HIGHEST MANHOOD

(An Address Delivered at Clifton College, Sunday Evening, October 1879)

WHAT is it in such societies as yours that gives them so strong a hold on, so unique an attraction for, those who have been for years engaged in the rough work of life? That the fact is so I think no one will deny, explain it how they will. I, at least, cannot remember to have met with any man who will not own that a visit to one of our great schools moves and touches him on a side of his nature which, for the most part, lies quiet, almost dormant, but which he feels it is good for him should be stirred. He may go back to his work without an effort to explain to himself why these unwonted sensations have visited him, but not without a consciousness that he

has had a change of air which has done him good — that he has been in a bracing atmosphere, like that at the top of some high mountain pass, where the morning sun strikes earlier and more brightly than in the valleys where his daily task must be done.

To him who cares to pursue the inquiry, I think the conviction will come that to a stranger there is something at once inspiring and pathetic in such societies as this, standing apart as they do from, and yet so intimately connected with, the great outside world.

Inspiring, because he finds himself once again amongst these before whom the golden gates of active life are about to open, for good or evil — each one of whom holds in his hands the keys of those gates, the keys of light or of darkness, amongst whom faith is strong, hope bright, and ideals, untainted as yet by the world's slow stain, still count for a great power.

Pathetic, because he knows but too well how hard the path is to find, how steep to climb, on the further side of those golden gates — how often in the journey since he himself passed out from under them, his own faith and hope have burned dimly, and his ideal has faded away as he toiled on, or sat by the wayside, looking wistfully after it, till in the dust and jar, the heat and strain of the mighty highway, he has been again and again tempted to doubt whether it was indeed anything more than a phantom exhalation, which had taken shape in the glorious morning light, only to vanish when the workday sun had risen fairly above the horizon, and dispersed the colored mists.

He may well be pardoned if, at such times, the remembrance of the actual world in which he is living, and of the generation which moved into line on the great battlefield when he himself shouldered musket and knapsack, and passed into action out of the golden gates, should for a moment or two bring the pathetic side of the picture into strongest relief. "Where are they now who represented genius, valor, self-sacrifice, the invisible heavenly world to these? Are they dead? Has the high ideal died out of them? Will it be better with the new generation?"

Such thoughts, such doubts, will force themselves at times on us all, to be met as best we may. Happy the man who is able, not at all times and in all places, but on the whole, to hold them resolutely at arm's length, and to follow straight on, though often wearily and painfully, in the tracks of the divine visitor who

stood by his side in his youth, though sadly conscious of weary lengths of way, of gulfs and chasms, which since those days have come to stretch and yawn between him and his ideal — of the difference between the man God meant him to be — of the manhood he thought he saw so clearly in those early days — and the man he and the world have together managed to make of him.

I say, happy is that man. I had almost said that no other than he is happy in any true or noble sense, even in this hard materialist nineteenth century, when the faith that the weak must to the wall, that the strong alone are to survive, prevails as it never did before — which on the surface seems specially to be organized for the destruction of ideals and the quenching of enthusiasms. I feel deeply the responsibility of making any assertion on so moot a point to such an audience in such a place as this; nevertheless, even in our materialist age, I must urge you all, as you would do good work in the world, to take your stand resolutely and once for all, at school and all your lives through, on the side of the idealists.

In doing so I trust and believe I shall not be running counter to the teaching you are accustomed to hear in this place. I know that I should be running counter to it if anything I may say were to give the least encouragement to dreaminess or dawdling. Let me say, then, at once and emphatically, that nothing can be further from my wish or thought. The only idealism I plead for is not only compatible with sustained and vigorous work; it cannot be maintained without it.

The gospel of work is a true gospel, though not the only one, or the highest, and has been preached in our day by great teachers. And I do not deny that the advice I have just been giving you may seem at first sight to conflict with the work gospel. Listen, for instance, to the ring of it in the rugged and incisive words of one of our strongest poets: —

> «That low man seeks a little thing to do,
> Sees it and does it.
> This high man, with a great thing to pursue,
> Dies ere he knows it.
> That low man goes on adding one to one,
> His hundreds soon hit.
> This high man aiming at a million,
> Misses a unit.»

This sounds like a deliberate attack on the idealist, a direct preference of low to high aims and standards, of the seen to the unseen. It is in reality only a wholesome warning against aiming at any ideal by wrong methods, though the use of the words "low" and "high" is no doubt likely to mislead. The true idealist has no quarrel with the lesson of these lines; indeed, he would be glad to see them written on one of the doorposts of every great school, if only they were ballasted on the other by George Herbert's quaint and deeper wisdom: —

> "Pitch thy behavior low, thy projects high,
> So shalt thou humble and magnanimous be.
> Sink not in spirit: who aimeth at the sky,
> Shoots higher much than he that means a tree."

Both sayings are true, and worth carrying in your minds as part of their permanent furniture, and you will find that they will live there very peaceably side by side.

There is in truth no real antagonism between them. The seeming paradox, like so many others, disappears in the working world. In the stress of the great battle of life it will trouble no soldier who keeps a single eye in his head and a sound heart in his bosom. For he who has the clearest and intensest vision of what is at issue in that battle, and who acquits himself in it most manfully, will be the first to acknowledge that for him there has been no approach to victory except by the faithful doing day by day of the work which lay at his own threshold.

On the other hand, the universal experience of mankind — the dreary confession of those who have merely sought a "low thing," and "gone on adding one to one," making that the aim and object of their lives — unites in warning us that on these lines no true victory can be had, either for the man himself or for the cause he was sent into the world to maintain.

No, there is no victory possible for boy or man without humility and magnanimity; and no humility or magnanimity possible without an ideal. I have been pleading with you boys to take sides with the idealists at once and through life. I have told you unless you do so you can neither be truly humble nor truly magnanimous. You may reply: "Well, that advice may be good or bad, we cannot tell, until you tell us how we are to side with them, and what you mean by an idealist." Such a reply would be only reasonable, and I will try to answer the demand it

makes, or at any rate to give you a few hints which will enable you to work out the question for yourselves.

There is not one amongst you all, I care not how young he may be, who has not heard or felt the call in his own heart to put aside all evil habits, and to live a brave, simple, truthful life in this school. It may have come to you while listening in chapel or elsewhere to religious teaching, or in the play fields or dormitories; when you have been alone or in company, at work or at play; but that it has come, at some time, in some place, there is not a boy in this chapel who will deny. It is no modern, no Christian experience, this. The choice of Hercules, and numberless other Pagan stories, the witness of nearly all histories and all literature, attest that it is an experience common to all our race. It is of it that the poet is thinking in those fine lines of Emerson which are written up in the Hall of Marlborough College: —

> "So close is glory to our dust,
> So near is God to man —
> When duty whispers low, 'Thou must,'
> The youth replies, 'I can.'"

If you have not already felt it, you will assuredly feel, as soon as you leave these walls, that your lot is cast in a world which longs for nothing so much as to succeed in shaking off all belief in anything which cannot be tested by the senses, and gauged and measured by the intellect, as the trappings of a worn-out superstition. Men have been trying, so runs the new gospel, to live by faith, and not by sight, ever since there is any record at all of their lives; and so they have had to manufacture for themselves the faiths they were to live by. What is called the life of the soul or spirit, and the life of the understanding, have been in conflict all this time, and the one has always been gaining on the other. Stronghold after stronghold has fallen, till it is clear almost to demonstration that there will soon be no place left for that which was once deemed all-powerful. The spiritual life can no longer be led honestly. Man has no knowledge of the invisible upon which he can build. Let him own the truth and turn to that upon which he can build safely — the world of matter, his knowledge of which is always growing — and be content with the things he can see and taste and handle. Those who are telling you still in this time that your life can and ought to be lived in daily communion with the unseen — that so only you

can loyally control the visible — are either willfully deceiving you, or are dreamers and visionaries.

So the high priests of the new gospel teach, and their teaching echoes through our literature, and colors the life of the streets and markets in a thousand ways; and a Mammon-ridden generation, longing to be rid of what they hope are only certain old and clumsy superstitions,— which they try to believe injurious to others, and are quite sure make them uneasy in their own efforts to eat, drink, and be merry,— applauds as openly as it dares, and hopes soon to see the millennium of the fleshpots publicly declared and recognized.

Against which, wherever you may encounter them, that you young Englishmen may be ready and able to stand fast is the hope and prayer of many anxious hearts in a time, charged on every side with signs of the passing away of old things, such as have not been seen above the horizon in Christendom since Luther nailed his protest on the church door of a German village.

VICTOR HUGO

(1802–1885)

IN 'LES MISERABLES' Victor Hugo has written what the reading world accepts almost without dissent as the greatest novel of the nineteenth century. By virtue of his lyrics and his dramas, he belongs to the first rank of French poets. As an orator, he is second among Frenchmen only to Mirabeau — and not, indeed, to Mirabeau himself in the field where the highest success depends on giving the fullest possible expression to the deepest and strongest emotion.

During his life, from his schooldays, when he wrote two tragedies and a melodrama, until he had passed his eightieth year, his mind was almost incredibly active and enormously productive. He wrote odes, ballads, tragedies, melodramas, novels, reviews, political diatribes, criticisms, travels, newspaper editorials — everything in fine that he thought calculated to inspire or to direct the intellect of France. He studied the literature of the world for the purposes of his own growth; but broad as he was in his range after food for his own intellect, he was the most typical of Parisians in all his methods of expression. To him France was the leader of civilization as Paris was of France. When he had become the intellectual dictator of Paris, he felt that he had conquered the world; and to this feeling is due no small part of his success. If it made him excessively egotistical, it made him absolutely fearless in expressing himself. When he speaks, he feels that his first duty is to satisfy his own sense of the artistic — which is for him a synonym for the noble, the true, the sublime. Having satisfied himself and Paris, he feels that if the world does not approve, it is the world's misfortune always — never his fault. He was so absolutely fearless in the conviction of his own strength that he did not hesitate to match himself against "Napoleon the Little"; and since the time of Alcæus, genius has never done itself greater honor than in the struggle for French liberty, which ended for Hugo in defeat and exile.

The literary style which he made so celebrated in 'Les Miserables' is essentially oratorical. No writer of less genius than his own could have sustained it in so extensive a work; but no matter how high-pitched seems his mode of expression, his thought is always pitched above it. The secret of his success as a writer and as

an orator lies chiefly in his deep religious feeling and his sensitiveness to human suffering. He had an intellect so extraordinary in its scope that he could stand one day before a Parisian audience and compel it to "intense emotion" by holding up the passion of Christ as the divine source of liberty and progress; while again before the same audience he could eulogize Voltaire as the instrument of heaven, appointed to redeem the world from the barbarism of the Dark Ages. In this he saw no inconsistency, nor in such antitheses as "Jesus wept — Voltaire smiled" — impossible outside of Paris — did it ever occur to him that there was the least savor of blasphemy. It would have seemed to him rather that he was honoring Christ in honoring the good done by Voltaire at the expense of the evil. He is governed by the same feeling in 'Les Miserables' when he regenerates a galley slave and makes of him the highest example of the Christ-type in literature. The supreme daring of such attempts required a supreme genius to prevent the result from being incoherent and repulsive. Undoubtedly, Hugo had supreme genius,—

> "For to his hand, more tame
> Than birds in winter, came
> High-thoughts and flying forms of power,
> And from his table fed and sang
> Till with the tune men's ears took fire and rang!"

W. V. B.

ORATION ON HONORÉ DE BALZAC

(Delivered at the Funeral of Balzac, August 20th, 1850)

Gentlemen:—

The man who now goes down into this tomb is one of those to whom public grief pays homage.

In our day all fictions have vanished. The eye is fixed not only on the heads that reign, but on heads that think, and the whole country is moved when one of those heads disappears. To-day we have a people in black because of the death of the man of talent; a nation in mourning for a man of genius.

Gentlemen, the name of Balzac will be mingled in the luminous trace our epoch will leave across the future.

Balzac was one of that powerful generation of writers of the nineteenth century who came after Napoleon, as the illustrious Pleiad of the seventeenth century came after Richelieu,— as if in the development of civilization there were a law which gives conquerors by the intellect as successors to conquerors by the sword.

Balzac was one of the first among the greatest, one of the highest among the best. This is not the place to tell all that constituted this splendid and sovereign intelligence. All his books form but one book,—a book living, luminous, profound, where one sees coming and going and marching and moving, with I know not what of the formidable and terrible, mixed with the real, all our contemporary civilization;—a marvelous book which the poet entitled "a comedy" and which he could have called history; which takes all forms and all style, which surpasses Tacitus and Suetonius; which traverses Beaumarchais and reaches Rabelais;—a book which realizes observation and imagination, which lavishes the true, the esoteric, the commonplace, the trivial, the material, and which at times through all realities, swiftly and grandly rent away, allows us all at once a glimpse of a most sombre and tragic ideal. Unknown to himself whether he wished it or not, whether he consented or not, the author of this immense and strange work is one of the strong race of Revolutionist writers. Balzac goes straight to the goal. Body to body he seizes modern society; from all he wrests something, from these an illusion, from those a hope; from one a catchword, from another a mask. He ransacked vice, he dissected passion. He searched out and sounded man, soul, heart, entrails, brain,—the abyss that each one has within himself. And by grace of his free and vigorous nature; by a privilege of the intellect of our time, which, having seen revolutions face to face, can see more clearly the destiny of humanity and comprehend Providence better,—Balzac redeemed himself smiling and severe from those formidable studies which produced melancholy in Molière and misanthropy in Rousseau.

This is what he has accomplished among us, this is the work which he has left us,—a work lofty and solid,—a monument robustly piled in layers of granite, from the height of which hereafter his renown shall shine in splendor. Great men make their own pedestal, the future will be answerable for the statue.

His death stupefied Paris! Only a few months ago he had come back to France. Feeling that he was dying, he wished to see his country again, as one who would embrace his mother on the eve of a distant voyage. His life was short, but full, more filled with deeds than days.

Alas! this powerful worker, never fatigued, this philosopher, this thinker, this poet, this genius, has lived among us that life

of storm, of strife, of quarrels and combats, common in all times to all great men. To-day he is at peace. He escapes contention and hatred. On the same day he enters into glory and the tomb. Hereafter beyond the clouds, which are above our heads, he will shine among the stars of his country. All you who are here, are you not tempted to envy him?

Whatever may be our grief in presence of such a loss, let us accept these catastrophes with resignation! Let us accept in it whatever is distressing and severe; it is good perhaps, it is necessary perhaps, in an epoch like ours, that from time to time the great dead shall communicate to spirits, devoured with skepticism and doubt, a religious fervor. Providence knows what it does when it puts the people face to face with the supreme mystery and when it gives them death to reflect on,—death which is supreme equality, as it is also supreme liberty. Providence knows what it does, since it is the greatest of all instructors.

There can be but austere and serious thoughts in all hearts when a sublime spirit makes its majestic entrance into another life, when one of those beings who have long soared above the crowd on the visible wings of genius, spreading all at once other wings which we did not see, plunges swiftly into the unknown.

No, it is not the unknown; no, I have said it on another sad occasion and I shall repeat it to-day; no, it is not night, it is light. It is not the end, it is the beginning! It is not extinction, it is eternity! Is it not true, my hearers, such tombs as this demonstrate immortality? In presence of the illustrious dead, we feel more distinctly the divine destiny of that intelligence which traverses the earth to suffer and to purify itself,—which we call man.

THE LIBERTY TREE IN PARIS

(Delivered at the Planting of the Liberty Tree in the Place des Vosges, 1848)

It is with joy that I yield to the call of my fellow-citizens, and come to hail in their midst the hopes of emancipation, of order, and of peace which will germinate, blent with the roots of this tree of Liberty.

What a true and beautiful symbol for Liberty is this tree! Liberty has its roots in the hearts of the people, as the tree in the heart of the earth; like the tree it raises and spreads its

branches to heaven; like the tree it is ceaseless in its growth, and it covers generations with its shade!

The first tree of Liberty was planted eighteen hundred years ago by God himself on Golgotha! The first tree of Liberty was that cross on which Jesus Christ was offered a sacrifice, for the liberty, equality, and fraternity of the human race!

The significance of this tree has not changed in eighteen centuries! Only let us not forget that with new times are new duties. The revolution which our fathers made sixty years ago was great by war; the revolution which you make to-day should be great by peace. The first destroyed; the second should organize! The work of organization is the necessary complement to the work of destruction. It is that which connects 1848 intimately to 1789. To establish, to create, to produce, to pacify; to satisfy all rights, to develop all the grand instincts of man, to provide for all the needs of society,—this is the task of the future! And in the times in which we live, the future comes quickly!

One can almost say the future is but to-morrow! It commences to-day! To the task then! To the task, workers with hands; workers with intelligence; you who hear me, you who surround me! Complete this great work of the fraternal organization of all peoples, leading to the same object, attached to the same idea, and living with the same heart. Let us all be men of good-will, let us spare neither our toil nor our sweat. Let us spread among all the peoples who surround us and over the whole world sympathy, charity, and fraternity.

For three centuries the world has imitated France; for three centuries France has been the first of nations. And do you know what that means,—"the first of nations"? It means the greatest, it should also mean the best. My friends, my brothers, my fellow-citizens, let us establish throughout the whole world, by the grandeur of our example, the empire of our ideas! That each nation may be happy and proud to resemble France!

Let us unite, then, in one common thought, and join with me in the cry: "Hail to Universal Liberty! All hail to the Universal Republic!"

ON THE CENTENNIAL OF VOLTAIRE'S DEATH

(From the Speech Delivered at Paris, May 30th, 1878, the Hundredth Anniversary of Voltaire's Death — Revised from the Translation in the London Times of May 31st, 1878)

One hundred years ago to-day a man died! He died immortal, laden with years, with labors, and with the most illustrious and formidable of responsibilities,— the responsibility of the human conscience informed and corrected. He departed amid the curses of the past and the blessings of the future — and these are the two superb forms of glory! — dying amid the acclamations of his contemporaries and of posterity, on the one hand, and on the other with the hootings and hatreds bestowed by the implacable past on those who combat it. He was more than a man — he was an epoch! He had done his work; he had fulfilled the mission evidently chosen for him by the Supreme Will, which manifests itself as visibly in the laws of destiny as in the laws of nature. The eighty-four years he had lived bridge over the interval between the apogee of the Monarchy and the dawn of the Revolution. At his birth, Louis XIV. still reigned; at his death Louis XVI. had already mounted the throne. So that his cradle saw the last rays of the great throne and his coffin the first gleams from the great abyss. . . .

The court was full of festivities; Versailles was radiant; Paris was ignorant; and meanwhile, through religious ferocity, judges killed an old man on the wheel and tore out a child's tongue for a song. Confronted by this frivolous and dismal society, Voltaire alone, sensible of all the forces marshaled against him — court, nobility, finance; that unconscious power, the blind multitude; that terrible magistracy, so oppressive for the subject, so docile for the master, crushing and flattering, kneeling on the people before the king; that clergy, a sinister medley of hypocrisy and fanaticism — Voltaire alone declared war against this coalition of all social iniquities — against that great and formidable world. He accepted battle with it. What was his weapon? That which has the lightness of the wind and the force of a thunderbolt — a pen. With that weapon Voltaire fought, and with that he conquered! Let us salute that memory! He conquered! He waged a splendid warfare,— the war of one alone against all,— the grand war of mind against matter, of reason against prejudice; a war

for the just against the unjust, for the oppressed against the oppressor, the war of goodness, the war of kindness! He had the tenderness of a woman and the anger of a hero. His was a great mind and an immense heart. He conquered the old code, the ancient dogma! He conquered the feudal lord, the Gothic judge, the Roman priest. He bestowed on the populace the dignity of the people! He taught, pacified, civilized! He fought for Sirven and Montbailly as for Calas and Labarre. Regardless of menaces, insults, persecutions, calumny, exile, he was indefatigable and immovable. He overcame violence by a smile, despotism by sarcasm, infallibility by irony, obstinacy by perseverance, ignorance by truth! I have just uttered the word "smile," and I pause at it! "To smile!" That is Voltaire. Let us repeat it,—pacification is the better part of philosophy. In Voltaire the equilibrium was speedily restored. Whatever his just anger, it passed off. The angry Voltaire always gives place to the Voltaire of calmness; and then in that profound eye appears his smile. That smile is wisdom — that smile, I repeat, is Voltaire. It sometimes goes as far as a laugh, but philosophic sadness tempers it. It mocks the strong, it caresses the weak. Disquieting the oppressor, it reassures the oppressed. It becomes raillery against the great; pity for the little! Ah! let that smile sway us, for it had in it the rays of the dawn. It was an illumination for truth, for justice, for goodness, for the worthiness of the useful. It illuminated the inner stronghold of superstition. The hideous things it is salutary to see, he showed. It was a smile, fruitful as well as luminous! The new society, the desire for equality and concession; that beginning of fraternity called tolerance, mutual good-will, the just accord of men and right, the recognition of reason as the supreme law, the effacing of prejudices, serenity of soul, the spirit of indulgence and pardon, harmony and peace — behold what has resulted from that grand smile! On the day — undoubtedly close at hand — when the identity of wisdom and clemency will be recognized, when the amnesty is proclaimed, I say it! — yonder in the stars Voltaire will smile!

Between two servants of humanity who appeared at one thousand eight hundred years interval, there is a mysterious relation. To combat Pharisaism, unmask imposture, overturn tyrannies, usurpations, prejudices, falsehoods, superstitions — to demolish the temple in order to rebuild it — that is to say, to substitute

the true for the false, attack the fierce magistracy, the sanguinary priesthood; to scourge the money changers from the sanctuary; to reclaim the heritage of the disinherited; to protect the weak, poor, suffering, and crushed; to combat for the persecuted and oppressed — such was the war of Jesus Christ! And what man carried on that war? It was Voltaire! The evangelical work had for its complement the philosophic work; the spirit of mercy commenced, the spirit of tolerance continued, let us say it with a sentiment of profound respect: Jesus wept — Voltaire smiled. From that divine tear and that human smile sprang the mildness of existing civilization. . . .

Alas! the present moment, worthy as it is of admiration and respect, has still its dark side. There are still clouds on the horizon; the tragedy of the peoples is not played out; war still raises its head over this august festival of peace. Princes for two years have persisted in a fatal misunderstanding; their discord is an obstacle to our concord, and they are ill-inspired in condemning us to witness the contrast. This contrast brings us back to Voltaire. Amid these threatening events let us be more peaceful than ever. Let us bow before this great death, this great life, this great living spirit. Let us bend before this venerated sepulchre! Let us ask counsel of him whose life, useful to men, expired a hundred years ago, but whose work is immortal. Let us ask counsel of other mighty thinkers, auxiliaries of this glorious Voltaire — of Jean Jacques, Diderot, Montesquieu! Let us stop the shedding of human blood. Enough, despots! Barbarism still exists. Let philosophy protest. Let the eighteenth century succor the nineteenth. The philosophers, our predecessors, are the apostles of truth. Let us invoke these illustrious phantoms that, face to face with monarchies thinking of war, they may proclaim the right of man to life, the right of conscience to liberty, the sovereignty of reason, the sacredness of labor, the blessedness of peace! And since night issues from thrones, let light emanate from the tombs.

MORAL FORCE IN WORLD POLITICS

(Peroration of the Speech on Poland, March 19th, 1846, in the Chamber of Peers, Paris)

Gentlemen:—

The elements of power of a great nation are not alone its fleets, its armies, the wisdom of its laws, the extent of its territories. Over and above these, the elements of the power of a great nation are its moral influence, the authority of its reason and enlightenment, its ascendency among civilized nations.

Well, gentlemen, what is asked of you is not to force France into the impossible and the unknown. What we would ask you to enlist in this question are not the armies and fleets of France; not her continental and military power; it is rather her moral ascendency, the authority she so legitimately wields among the peoples,—this great nation, which for three centuries for the profit of the world has been essaying all the experiences of civilization and progress.

But what, it may be asked, is "a moral intervention"? Can it have material and positive results?

For reply, a single example! At the commencement of the last century, the Spanish Inquisition was still all-powerful. It was a formidable force that dominated royalty itself, and from the laws had almost passed into the very habits of the people. In the first half of the eighteenth century, from 1700 to 1750, the holy office had made not less than twelve thousand victims, of whom one thousand six hundred died at the stake! Well, listen now! In the second half of the century, the same Inquisition had only ninety-seven victims, and of this number how many were burned at the stake? Not one! Not one! Between these two totals, "one thousand six hundred burned at the stake" and "not one," what was there? Was there a war? Was there the direct and armed intervention of any nation? Was there the efforts of our fleets and troops, or simply our diplomacy? No, gentlemen, there was but this—a moral intervention! Voltaire and France had spoken! The Inquisition was dead! To-day as then a moral intervention may suffice. Let the press and the tribunes of France raise their voices, that France may speak, and in due season Poland will be reborn.

Let France speak, and the savage acts we deplore will become impossible, and Austria and Russia will be constrained to imitate the noble examples of Prussia and accept the noble sympathies of Germany for Poland. Gentlemen, but a word more: the unity of a people incarnates itself in two ways,—in dynasties and in nationalities. It is in this manner, under this double form, that the difficult labor of civilization, the common work of humanity, is accomplished; in this way is produced illustrious kings and mighty peoples.

It is in becoming a nationality or a dynasty that the past of an empire becomes fecund and can produce its future. So it is a fatality when people crush dynasties, but it is a much more fatal thing when princes crush nationalities.

Gentlemen, the Polish nationality was glorious. It should have been respected. Let France notify the princes that she fixes a term for and makes protest against these barbarities. When France speaks, the world listens; when France advises, there is a mysterious working in the souls of men and the ideas of right, of liberty, of humanity, and of reason begin budding among all peoples.

In all times, at all epochs, France has played a great part in civilization, and this but by her strength of soul, the power exercised by Rome in the Middle Ages. Rome was then as a State but in the fourth rank, but as a power, of the first order. Why? Because Rome leaned upon the religion of the people, on the thing from which all civilizations have flowed. This, gentlemen, made Catholic Rome powerful at an epoch when all Europe was barbarous. To-day, France has inherited a part of this spiritual power of Rome. France has, in matters of civilization, the authority that Rome had and still has in the things of religion.

Do not be astonished, gentlemen, to hear me use as synonyms such words as civilization and religion! Civilization is but applied religion! France has been and is still more than ever the nation which presides over the development of other peoples. From this discussion will result at least this: Princes possessing peoples possess them not as masters, but as fathers,—the only master, the true master, is elsewhere; sovereignty is not in dynasties, it is not in princes, it is not even in the people, it is higher; sovereignty inheres in the sum of all ideas of order and of justice! Sovereignty is in Truth!

When a people is oppressed, justice suffers; truth, the sovereignty of right, is offended; when a prince is unjustly outraged or precipitated from his throne, justice equally suffers, civilization suffers. There is an eternal solidarity between the ideas of justice which make the rights of peoples and the ideas of justice which make the rights of princes. Say it to-day to crowned heads as you would, when needed, say it to the people. Let the men who rule other men know that the moral power of France is great. Once the malediction of Rome could place an empire outside the pale of the religious world. To-day, the indignation of France can cast a prince outside of the civilized world.

It is necessary, then, it must be, that the French tribune at this hour shall raise, in behalf of the Polish nation, an independent and disinterested voice; that it shall proclaim on this occasion, as on all others, the eternal ideas of order and justice, and that in the name of stability and civilization she shall defend the cause of oppressed Poland.

After all our discords and all our wars, the two nations of which I spoke at the beginning: this France which has raised and ripened civilization in Europe; this Poland which defended it, have experienced different destinies. One has been curtailed but still remains great; the other has been enchained but still remains proud. These two nations should understand each other, should have for each other the profound sympathy of two sisters who have struggled together. Both, I repeat, have done much for Europe; one has lavished herself, the other has devoted herself.

Gentlemen, let me finish in a word. The intervention of France is the great question occupying us; this intervention ought not to be material, direct, military! I do not believe in that. This intervention must be an intervention purely moral; it should be the adhesion and nobly-expressed sympathy of a great people, happy and prosperous, for another people oppressed and stricken down. Nothing more, but nothing less.

THOMAS HENRY HUXLEY

(1825–1895)

FOR a quarter of a century after Darwin began his work as a biologist, not only scientific but popular interest in the study of the physiology of animal life increased progressively. Darwin was never a popular writer, and his conclusions are so involved in the immense mass of facts he accumulated that he would never have been generally intelligible to busy people except for the work of such interpreters as Doctor Huxley — perhaps the ablest, as he was certainly the most eloquent and entertaining of all the naturalists whom Darwin's labors inspired to attempt to solve the problem of the origin of life. As Huxley presently declared that there was no scientific solution for it, that life and matter in their origin are scientifically «unknowable,» he presently came to be recognized as the head of the «Agnostic School.» Indeed, he himself accepted, if he did not invent, this term to describe his conclusions. He did not mean, however, that he was an «agnostic» in a theological sense; and when he stepped beyond the line of science, he did not hesitate to declare his faith in a Divine Power, to which he could trust himself and the world with full confidence. He said, indeed, that he would have been perfectly satisfied to have been «wound up» by it, like a clock or a watch, and divested of all ability to go wrong, either from choice or accident. His agnosticism meant merely that the supernatural belongs to faith — the natural alone to science. He was not orthodox, however, by the standard of any theologian of his day, and he seems to have taken a great delight in exasperating as many as possible of them — whether Catholic or Protestant, members of the English Establishment, or Dissenters. He was born near London, May 4th, 1825, and educated at Ealing School and Charing Cross Hospital. His professional career, begun as an assistant surgeon in the English navy, ended with the highest honors scientific England had to give — including the rectorship of Aberdeen University and the presidency of the Royal Society. He died June 24th, 1895.

THE THREEFOLD UNITY OF LIFE

(Exordium of the Address, 'The Physical Basis of Life,' Delivered at Edinburgh, November 8th, 1868)

IN ORDER to make the title of this discourse generally intelligible, I have translated the term "Protoplasm," which is the scientific name of the substance of which I am about to speak, by the words "the physical basis of life." I suppose that to many the idea that there is such a thing as a physical basis, or matter, of life may be novel — so widely spread is the conception of life as a something which works through matter, but is independent of it; and even those who are aware that matter and life are inseparably connected may not be prepared for the conclusion plainly suggested by the phrase, "the physical basis or matter of life," that there is some one kind of matter which is common to all living beings, and that their endless diversities are bound together by a physical, as well as an ideal, unity. In fact, when first apprehended, such a doctrine as this appears almost shocking to common sense.

What, truly, can seem to be more obviously different from one another, in faculty, in form, and in substance, than the various kinds of living beings? What community of faculty can there be between the brightly-colored lichen, which so nearly resembles a mere mineral incrustation of the bare rock on which it grows, and the painter, to whom it is instinct with beauty, or the botanist, whom it feeds with knowledge?

Again, think of the microscopic fungus — a mere infinitesimal ovoid particle, which finds space and duration enough to multiply into countless millions in the body of a living fly; and then of the wealth of foliage, the luxuriance of flower and fruit which lies between this bald sketch of a plant and the giant pine of California, towering to the dimensions of a cathedral spire, or the Indian fig, which covers acres with its profound shadow, and endures while nations and empires come and go around its vast circumference. Or, turning to the other half of the world of life, picture to yourselves the great Finner whale, hugest of beasts that live, or have lived, disporting his eighty or ninety feet of bone, muscle, and blubber, with easy roll, among waves in which the stoutest ship that ever left dockyard would founder hopelessly; and contrast him with the invisible animalcules — mere

gelatinous specks, multitudes of which could, in fact, dance upon the point of a needle with the same ease as the angels of the Schoolmen could, in imagination. With these images before your minds, you may well ask what community of form or structure is there between the animalcule and the whale; or between the fungus and the fig tree. And, *a fortiori*, between all four.

Finally, if we regard substance, or material composition, what hidden bond can connect the flower which a girl wears in her hair and the blood which courses through her youthful veins; or what is there in common between the dense and resisting mass of the oak, or the strong fabric of the tortoise, and those broad disks of glassy jelly which may be seen pulsating through the waters of a calm sea, but which drain away to mere films in the hand which raises them out of their element?

Such objections as these must, I think, arise in the mind of every one who ponders for the first time upon the conception of a single physical basis of life, underlying all the diversities of vital existence; but I propose to demonstrate to you that, notwithstanding these apparent difficulties, a threefold unity — namely, a unity of power or faculty, a unity of form, and a unity of substantial composition — does pervade the whole living world.

No very abstruse argumentation is needed, in the first place, to prove that the powers or faculties of all kinds of living matter, diverse as they may be in degree, are substantially similar in kind.

Goethe has condensed a survey of all the powers of mankind into the well-known epigram:—

> «Warum treibt sich das Volk so und schreit?
> Es will sich ernähren,
> Kinder zeugen, und die nähren so gut es vermag.
> . . . . . .
> Weiter bringt es kein Mensch, stell' er sich wie
> er auch will.»

In physiological language, this means that all the multifarious and complicated activities of man are comprehensible under three categories. Either they are immediately directed toward the maintenance and development of the body, or they effect transitory changes in the relative positions of parts of the body, or they tend toward the continuance of the species. Even those manifestations of intellect, of feeling, and of will, which we

rightly name the higher faculties, are not excluded from this classification, inasmuch as to every one but the subject of them, they are known only as transitory changes in the relative positions of parts of the body. Speech, gesture, and every other form of human action are, in the long run, resolvable into muscular contraction, and muscular contraction is but a transitory change in the relative positions of the parts of a muscle. But the scheme which is large enough to embrace the activities of the highest form of life covers all those of the lower creatures. The lowest plant, or animalcule, feeds, grows, and reproduces its kind. In addition, all animals manifest those transitory changes of form which we class under irritability and contractility; and it is more than probable that, when the vegetable world is thoroughly explored, we shall find all plants in possession of the same powers, at one time or other of their existence. . . .

And now, what is the ultimate fate, and what the origin, of the matter of life?

Is it, as some of the older naturalists supposed, diffused throughout the universe in molecules, which are indestructible and unchangeable in themselves; but, in endless transmigration, unite in innumerable permutations into the diversified forms of life we know? Or is the matter of life composed of ordinary matter, differing from it only in the manner which its atoms are aggregated? Is it built up of ordinary matter, and again resolved into ordinary matter when its work is done?

Modern science does not hesitate a moment between these alternatives. Physiology writes over the portals of life—

"*Debemur morti nos nostraque,*"

with a profounder meaning than the Roman poet attached to that melancholy line. Under whatever disguise it takes refuge, whether fungus or oak, worm or man, the living protoplasm not only ultimately dies and is resolved into its mineral and lifeless constituents, but is always dying, and, strange as the paradox may sound, could not live unless it died.

In the wonderful story of the 'Peau de Chagrin,' the hero becomes possessed of a magical wild ass's skin which yields him the means of gratifying all his wishes. But its surface represents the duration of the proprietor's life; and for every satisfied desire the skin shrinks in proportion to the intensity of fruition,

until at length life and the last handbreadth of the *peau de chagrin* disappear with the gratification of a last wish.

Balzac's studies had led him over a wide range of thought and speculation, and his shadowing forth of physiological truth in this strange story may have been intentional. At any rate, the matter of life is a veritable *peau de chagrin*, and for every vital act it is somewhat the smaller. All work implies waste, and the work of life results, directly or indirectly, in the waste of protoplasm.

Every word uttered by a speaker costs him some physical loss; and in the strictest sense, he burns that others may have light — so much eloquence, so much of his body resolved into carbonic acid, water, and urea. It is clear that this process of expenditure cannot go on forever. But, happily, the protoplasmic *peau de chagrin* differs from Balzac's in its capacity of being repaired, and brought back to its full size, after every exertion.

For example, this present lecture, whatever its intellectual worth to you, has a certain physical value to me, which is, conceivably, expressible by the number of grains of protoplasm and other bodily substance wasted in maintaining my vital processes during its delivery. My *peau de chagrin* will be distinctly smaller at the end of the discourse than it was at the beginning. By and by, I shall probably have recourse to the substance commonly called mutton, for the purpose of stretching it back to its original size. Now this mutton was once the living protoplasm, more or less modified, of another animal — a sheep. As I shall eat it, it is the same matter altered, not only by death, but by exposure to sundry artificial operations in the process of cooking.

But these changes, whatever be their extent, have not rendered it incompetent to resume its old functions as matter of life. A singular inward laboratory, which I possess, will dissolve a certain portion of the modified protoplasm; the solution so formed will pass into my veins; and the subtle influences to which it will then be subjected will convert the dead protoplasm into living protoplasm, and transubstantiate sheep into man.

Nor is this all. If digestion were a thing to be trifled with, I might sup upon lobster, and the matter of life of the crustacean would undergo the same wonderful metamorphosis into humanity. And were I to return to my own place by sea, and undergo shipwreck, the crustacea might, and probably would, return the compliment, and demonstrate our common nature by

turning my protoplasm into living lobster. Or, if nothing better were to be had, I might supply my wants with mere bread, and I should find the protoplasm of the wheat plant to be convertible into man, with no more trouble than that of the sheep, and with far less, I fancy, than that of the lobster.

Hence, it appears to be a matter of no great moment what animal or what plant I lay under contribution for protoplasm, and the fact speaks volumes for the general identity of that substance in all living beings. I share this catholicity of assimilation with other animals, all of which, so far as we know, could thrive equally well on the protoplasm of any of their fellows, or of any plant; but here the assimilative powers of the animal world cease. A solution of smelling-salts in water, with an infinitesimal proportion of some other saline matters, contains all the elementary bodies which enter into the composition of protoplasm; but, as I need hardly say, a hogshead of that fluid would not keep a hungry man from starving, nor would it save any animal whatever from a like fate. An animal cannot make protoplasm, but must take it ready-made from some other animal or some plant — the animal's highest feat of constructive chemistry being to convert dead protoplasm into that living matter of life which is appropriate to itself.

Therefore, in seeking for the origin of protoplasm, we must eventually turn to the vegetable world. The fluid containing carbonic acid, water, and ammonia, which offers such a Barmecide feast to the animal, is a table richly spread to multitudes of plants; and, with a due supply of only such materials, many a plant will not only maintain itself in vigor, but grow and multiply until it has increased a millionfold, or a million millionfold, the quantity of protoplasm which it originally possessed; in this way building up the matter of life to an indefinite extent from the common matter of the universe.

EDWARD HYDE, EARL OF CLARENDON

(1608–1674)

EDWARD HYDE, afterwards first Earl of Clarendon, is remarkable, though by no means singular, among the great men of his day, in having achieved a double reputation, first as a reformer and Radical, and afterwards as a Conservative and restorer of royal authority. He was born at Dinton, in Wiltshire, February 18th, 1608, and at the age of thirty-two entered political life as a Member of Parliament when the struggle between Charles I. and the Commons was at its most critical stage. Hyde took the popular side against the King in Hampden's case and in the impeachment of Lord Keeper Finch; but when attack was made on Episcopacy as a church establishment, he began to lean to the royal cause and finally, after the retreat of the King from London, he left his seat in the House of Commons and joined him at York. In 1643 he became Chancellor of the Exchequer under Charles I., and after the restoration was Lord Chancellor of England from 1660 to 1667, under Charles II. His devotion to the interests of royalty was too logical to suit the dissolute King, and it rendered him so odious to the Commons that in 1667 he was impeached for high treason. Deserted by the King, he was obliged to leave the country for France, where he died December 9th, 1674. He is best known by his 'True Historical Narrative of the Rebellion and Civil Wars of England,' and by his 'Autobiography,'— works which stand at the head of their class in the literature of the Stuart period.

«DISCRETION» AS DESPOTISM

(Delivered in the House of Lords, April 24th, 1641)

I AM commanded by the knights, citizens, and burgesses of the House of Commons to present to your lordships a great and crying grievance, which though it be complained of in the present pressures, but by the northern parts, yet by the logic and consequence of it, it is the grievance of the whole kingdom. The Court of the Presidents, and Council of the North, or as it is more usually called, the Courts of York, which by the spirit and

ambition of the ministers, trusted there, or by the natural inclination of courts to enlarge their own power and jurisdiction, hath so prodigiously broken down the banks of the first council, in which it ran, hath almost overwhelmed that country under the sea of arbitrary power, and involved the people in a labyrinth of distemper, oppression, and poverty. . . .

What hath the good Northern people done, that they only must be disfranchised of all their privileges by Magna Charta and the Petition of Right; for to what purpose serve these statutes, if they may be fined and imprisoned without law, according to the discretions of the commissioners? What have they done, that they, and they alone of all the people of this happy island, must be disinherited of their birthright, of their inheritance? For prohibitions, writs of *habeas corpus*, writs of error are the birthright, the inheritance of the subjects.

And it is worth your lordships' observation that to those many prohibitions, which have been granted from above, for till of late, the court of York had not the courage to oppose prohibitions, nor, indeed, till our courts here had not the courage to grant them. It was never known that courts pleaded the jurisdiction of their council, which, without doubt, they would have done upon the advantage of many great persons, in whose protection they have always been, had they not known the law could not be misinterpreted enough to allow it.

Your lordships remember the directions I mentioned of Magna Charta, that all proceedings shall be *per legale judicium parium et per legem terræ*. Now, these jurisdictions tell you you shall proceed according to your discretion,— that is, you shall do what you please, only that as we may not suspect this discretion will be gentler and kinder to us than the law, special provision is made that no fine, no punishment shall be less than by the law is appointed? By no means, but as much greater as your discretion shall think fit; and, indeed, in this improvement we find arbitrary courts are very pregnant. If the law requires my good behavior, this discretion makes me close prisoner; if the law sets me upon the pillory, this discretion appoints me to leave my ears there.

But this "proceeding according to discretion" is no new expression. It was in the first commission I told your lordships of, in the 31st of Henry VIII., that they should proceed *secundum legem et consuetudinem regni Angliæ, vel aliter secundum sanas discretones vestras*, which, in the interpretation of the law,

and that is the best interpretation, signifies the same thing. To proceed according to discretion is to proceed according to law, which is *summa discretio*, but not according to their private conceit or affection; for *talis discretio* (says the law) *discretionem confundit;* and such a confusion hath this discretion in these instructions produced, as if discretion were only removed from rage and fury! No inconvenience, no mischief, no disgrace, that the malice, or insolence, or the curiosity of these commissioners had a mind to bring upon that people, but through the latitude and power of this discretion the poor people have felt! This discretion hath been the quicksand which hath swallowed up their property, their liberty! I beseech your lordships to rescue them from this discretion.

Besides, the charge that this court is to his Majesty, which is near £1,300 per annum, your lordships will easily guess what an unsupportable burden the many officers (whose places are of great value), the attorneys, clerks, registers, and above one thousand solicitors that attend the courts, must be to that people (insomuch) that in truth the country seems to be divided into officers and dependants upon that court; and the people upon whom these officers of that court prey and commit rapines, as is said in Petronius: *Omnes hic aut captantur, aut captant; aut cadavera quæ lacerantur, aut corvi qui lacerant.* Truly, my lords, these vexed, worn people of the North are not suitors to your lordships, to regulate this court, or to reform the judges of it, but for extirpating these judges, and the utter abolishing of this court. They are of Cato's mind, who would not submit to Cæsar for his life, saying he would not be beholding to a tyrant for injustice, for it was injustice in him to take upon him to save a man's life over whom he had no power.

IN JOHN HAMPDEN'S CASE

(From His Speech in the Case of Ship-Money, between the King and John Hampden, 13th Exchequer, Charles I., 1636)

THERE cannot be a greater instance of a sick and languishing commonwealth than the business of this day. Good God! how have the guilty these late years been punished, when the judges themselves have been such delinquents! It is no marvel that an irregular, extravagant, arbitrary power, like a tor-

rent hath broke in upon us, when our banks and our bulwarks, the laws, were in the custody of such persons. Men who had lost their innocence could not preserve their courage; nor could we look that they who had so visibly undone us themselves should have the virtue or credit to rescue us from the oppression of other men. It was said by one who always spoke excellently, that the twelve judges were like the twelve lions under the throne of Solomon: "Under the throne in obedience, but yet lions." Your lordships shall this day hear of six, who (be they what they will be else) were no lions, who upon vulgar fears delivered up the precious forts they were trusted with, almost without assault; and in a tame easy trance of flattery and servitude, lost and forfeited (shamefully forfeited) that reputation, awe, and reverence which the wisdom, courage, and gravity of their venerable predecessors had contracted and fastened to the places they now hold, and even rendered that study and profession, which in all ages hath been (and I hope now shall be) of an honorable estimation, so contemptible and vile, that had not this blessed day come, all men would have had that quarrel to the law itself which Marcius had to the Greek tongue; who thought it a mockery to learn that language the masters whereof lived in bondage under others. And I appeal to these unhappy gentlemen themselves with what a strange negligence, scorn, and indignation the faces of all men, even of the meanest, have been directed towards them, since (to call it no worse) that fatal declension of their understandings in those judgments of which they stand here charged before your lordships. But, my lords, the work of this day is the greatest instance of a growing and thriving commonwealth too; and is as the dawning of a fair and lasting day of happiness to this kingdom.

It is in your lordships' power (and I am sure it is in your lordships' will) to restore the dejected broken people of this island to their former joy and security, the successors of these men to their own privileges and veneration: *Et sepultas prope leges revocare.* So these judges enter themselves and harden their hearts by more particular trespasses upon the law; by impositions and taxes upon the merchants in trade; by burdens and pressures upon the gentry in knighthood; before they could arrive at that universal destruction of the King by Ship-Money, which promised reward and security for all their former services by doing the work of a Parliament to his Majesty in supplies, and

seemed to delude justice in leaving none to judge them, by making the whole kingdom party to their oppression. My lords, the Commons assembled in Parliament hope that your lordships will call these judges speedily before you to answer these articles laid to their charge, that the nation may be satisfied in your lordships' justice upon them as their crimes demerit.

INDIAN ORATORS

ALTHOUGH doubt has been expressed that such speeches as those of Tecumseh, Logan, and Weatherford, as they appear in English translation, really represent the speeches as originally made in different Indian dialects, it seems to be well established that they are sufficiently faithful to give, not only the meaning, but the style and habits of expression which characterized the natural oratory of the American Indian. Colonel John Gibson's statement of how Logan's speech was reported is on file with the Jefferson Manuscripts in the State Department. It appears from it that the version here given is «a literal translation» of Logan's words, made by Colonel Gibson himself. It may be said of Tecumseh's address to General Proctor, that it is too much unlike anything in any Caucasian language to have been composed for him by the Caucasian reporter and translator, and the same is measurably true of Old Tassel's pathetic plea for his home against the continued aggression of the Tennessee pioneers. Weatherford's speech to General Jackson much more nearly approximates the Caucasian style than the others, a fact which may be accounted for, perhaps, by his strong infusion of Caucasian blood, though possibly its style is largely that of the reporter.

TECUMSEH—ADDRESS TO GENERAL PROCTOR

(Delivered September 18th, 1812, after Perry's Victory over the British Fleet)

FATHER, listen to your children! you have them now all before you. The war before this our British father gave the hatchet to his red children, when our old chiefs were alive. They are now dead. In that war our father was thrown on his back by the Americans; and our father took them by the hand without our knowledge; and we are afraid that our father will do so again at this time. Summer before last, when I came forward with my red brethren and was ready to take up the hatchet in favor of our British father, we were told not to be in a hurry, that he had not determined to fight the Americans. Listen! when war was declared, our father stood up and gave us the tomahawk, and told us that he was then ready to strike the

Americans; that he wanted our assistance, and that he would certainly get our lands back, which the Americans had taken from us. Listen! you told us at that time to bring forward our families to this place, and we did so; and you promised to take care of them, and they should want for nothing, while the men would go and fight the enemy; that we need not trouble ourselves about the enemy's garrisons; that we knew nothing about them, and that our father would attend to that part of the business. You also told your red children that you would take good care of your garrison here, which made our hearts glad. Listen! when we were last at the Rapids, it is true, we gave you little assistance. It is hard to fight people who live like ground hogs. Father, listen! our fleet has gone out; we know they have fought; we have heard the great guns; but we know nothing of what has happened to our father [Commodore Barclay] with one arm.

Our ships have gone one way, and we are much astonished to see our father tying up everything and preparing to run away the other, without letting his red children know what his intentions are. You always told us to remain here and take care of our lands; it made our hearts glad to hear that was your wish. Our great father, the king, is the head, and you represent him. You always told us you would never draw your foot off British ground; but now, father, we see that you are drawing back, and we are sorry to see our father doing so without seeing the enemy. We must compare our father's conduct to a fat dog, that carries his tail on his back, but when frightened, drops it between its legs and runs off. Father, listen! the Americans have not yet defeated us by land; neither are we sure that they have done so by water; we, therefore, wish to remain here and fight our enemy, should they make their appearance. If they defeat us, we will then retreat with our father. At the battle of the Rapids, last war, the Americans certainly defeated us; and when we returned to our father's fort at that place, the gates were shut against us. We were afraid that it would now be the case; but instead of that, we now see our British father preparing to march out with his garrison. Father, you have got the arms and ammunition which our great father sent for his red children. If you have an idea of going away, give them to us, and you may go and welcome, for us. Our lives are in the hands of the Great Spirit. We are determined to defend our lands; and if it be his will, we wish to leave our bones upon them.

LOGAN—SPEECH ON THE MURDER OF HIS FAMILY

(Delivered in 1774)

I APPEAL to any white man to say if ever he entered Logan's cabin hungry, and he gave him not meat; if ever he came cold and naked, and he clothed him not. During the course of the last long and bloody war, Logan remained idle in his camp, an advocate of peace. Such was my love for the whites that my countrymen pointed as I passed and said: "Logan is the friend of the white man." I had even thought to have lived with you, but for the injuries of one man. Colonel Cresap, the last spring, in cold blood, and unprovoked, murdered all the relations of Logan, not even sparing my women and children. There runs not a drop of my blood in the veins of any living creature. This called on me for revenge. I have sought it. I have killed many. I have fully glutted my vengeance. For my country, I rejoice at the beams of peace; but do not harbor a thought that mine is the joy of fear. Logan never felt fear. He will not turn on his heel to save his life. Who is there to mourn for Logan? Not one.

OLD TASSEL—HIS PLEA FOR HIS HOME

(Delivered September 25th, 1782, at a Conference with Colonel Joseph Martin)

BROTHER, I am now going to speak to you. I hope you will listen to me. I intended to come this fall and see you, but there was such confusion in our country, I thought it best for me to stay at home and send my Talks by my friend Colonel Martin, who promised to deliver them safe to you. We are a poor distressed people that is in great trouble, and we hope our elder brother will take pity on us and do us justice. Your people from Nolichucky are daily pushing us out of our lands. We have no place to hunt on. Your people have built houses within one day's walk of our towns. We don't want to quarrel with our elder brother; we therefore hope our elder brother will not take our lands from us that the Great Man above gave us. He made you and he made us; we are all his children, and we hope our elder brother will take pity on us, and not take our lands from us that our father gave us, because he is stronger

than we are. We are the first people that ever lived on this land; it is ours, and why will our elder brother take it from us? It is true, some time past, the people over the great water persuaded some of our young men to do some mischief to our elder brother, which our principal men were sorry for. But you, our elder brothers, came to our towns and took satisfaction, and then sent for us to come and treat with you, which we did. Then our elder brother promised to have the line run between us agreeable to the first treaty, and all that should be found over the line should be moved off. But it is not done yet. We have done nothing to offend our elder brother since the last treaty, and why should our elder brother want to quarrel with us? We have sent to the governor of Virginia on the same subject. We hope that between you both, you will take pity on your younger brother, and send Colonel Sevier, who is a good man, to have all your people moved off our land. I should say a great deal more, but our friend, Colonel Martin, knows all our grievances, and he can inform you.

WEATHERFORD—SPEECH TO GENERAL JACKSON

(Delivered after His Defeat at the Great Bend of the Tallapoosa, March 27th, 1814)

I AM in you power; do with me as you please. I am a soldier. I have done the white people all the harm I could; I have fought them, and fought them bravely. If I had an army, I would yet fight and contend to the last; but I have none; my people are all gone. I can do no more than weep over the misfortunes of my nation. Once I could animate my warriors to battle; but I cannot animate the dead. My warriors can no longer hear my voice: their bones are at Talladega, Tallushatches, Emuckfaw, and Tohopeka. I have not surrendered myself thoughtlessly. While there were chances of success I never left my post, nor supplicated peace; but my people are now gone, and I ask it for my nation and for myself. On the miseries and misfortunes brought on my country, I look back with deepest sorrow, and I wish to avert still greater calamities. If I had been left to contend with the Georgia army alone, I would have raised my corn on one bank of the river and fought them on the other; but your people have destroyed my nation. You are a

brave man; I rely on your generosity. You will exact no terms of a conquered people but such as they should accede to; whatever they may be, it would be madness and folly to oppose. If they are opposed, you will find me among the sternest enforcers of obedience. Those who would still hold out can only be influenced by a mean spirit of revenge, and to this they must not, and shall not, sacrifice the last remnant of their country.

RED JACKET—MISSIONARY EFFORT

[«In the summer of 1805,» says Moore, «a young Missionary named Cram was sent into the country of the Six Nations, by the Evangelical Missionary Society of Massachusetts, to found a mission among the Senecas. A council of their chiefs was convoked to hear his propositions. These were made in a short speech, to which the Indians listened with earnest attention.

After a long consultation among themselves, Red Jacket arose, and spoke as follows:»—]

Friend and Brother:—

IT WAS the will of the Great Spirit that we should meet together this day. He orders all things, and has given us a fine day for our council. He has taken his garment from before the sun, and caused it to shine with brightness upon us. Our eyes are opened, that we see clearly; our ears are unstopped, that we have been able to hear distinctly the words you have spoken. For all these favors we thank the Great Spirit; and him only.

Brother: This council fire was kindled by you. It was at your request that we came together at this time. We have listened with attention to what you have said. You requested us to speak our minds freely. This gives us great joy; for we now consider that we stand upright before you, and can speak what we think. All have heard your voice, and all speak to you now as one man. Our minds are agreed.

Brother: You say you want an answer to your talk before you leave this place. It is right you should have one, as you are a great distance from home, and we do not wish to detain you. But we will first look back a little, and tell you what our fathers have told us, and what we have heard from the white people.

Brother: Listen to what we say. There was a time when our forefathers owned this great island. Their seats extended from the rising to the setting sun. The Great Spirit had made it for

the use of Indians. He had created the buffalo, the deer, and other animals for food. He had made the bear and the beaver. Their skins served us for clothing. He had scattered them over the country, and taught us how to take them. He had caused the earth to produce corn for bread. All this he had done for his red children, because he loved them. If we had some disputes about our hunting ground, they were generally settled without the shedding of much blood. But an evil day came upon us. Your forefathers crossed the great water, and landed on this island. Their numbers were small. They found friends, and not enemies. They told us they had fled from their own country for fear of wicked men, and had come here to enjoy their religion. They asked for a small seat. We took pity on them, granted their request, and they sat down amongst us. We gave them corn and meat; they gave us poison (whisky) in return.

The white people, brother, had now found our country. Tidings were carried back, and more came amongst us. Yet we did not fear them. We took them to be friends. They called us brothers. We believed them, and gave them a larger seat. At length their numbers had greatly increased. They wanted more land; they wanted our country. Our eyes were opened, and our minds became uneasy. Wars took place. Indians were hired to fight against Indians, and many of our people were destroyed. They also brought strong liquor amongst us. It was strong and powerful, and has slain thousands.

Brother: Our seats were once large, and yours were small. You have now become a great people, and we have scarcely a place left to spread our blankets. You have got our country, but are not satisfied; you want to force your religion upon us.

Brother: Continue to listen. You say that you are sent to instruct us how to worship the Great Spirit agreeably to his mind; and if we do not take hold of the religion which you white people teach, we shall be unhappy hereafter. You say that you are right, and we are lost. How do we know this to be true? We understand that your religion is written in a book. If it were intended for us as well as you, why has not the Great Spirit given to us, and not only to us, but why did he not give to our forefathers the knowledge of that book, with the means of understanding it rightly? We only know what you tell us about it. How shall we know when to believe, being so often deceived by the white people?

Brother: You say there is but one way to worship and serve the Great Spirit. If there is but one religion, why do you white people differ so much about it? Why not all agreed, as you can all read the book?

Brother: We do not understand these things. We are told that your religion was given to your forefathers, and has been handed down from father to son. We also have a religion, which was given to our forefathers and has been handed down to us, their children. We worship in that way. It teaches us to be thankful for all the favors we receive; to love each other, and to be united. We never quarrel about religion.

Brother: The Great Spirit has made us all, but he has made a great difference between his white and red children. He has given us different complexions and different customs. To you he has given the arts. To these he has not opened our eyes. We know these things to be true. Since he has made so great a difference between us in other things, why may we not conclude that he has given us a different religion according to our understanding? The Great Spirit does right. He knows what is best for his children; we are satisfied.

Brother: We do not wish to destroy your religion, or take it from you. We only want to enjoy our own.

Brother: You say you have not come to get our land or our money, but to enlighten our minds. I will now tell you that I have been at your meetings, and saw you collect money from the meeting. I cannot tell what this money was intended for, but suppose that it was for your minister, and if we should conform to your way of thinking, perhaps you might want some from us.

Brother: We are told that you have been preaching to the white people in this place. These people are our neighbors. We are acquainted with them. We will wait a little while, and see what effect your preaching has upon them. If we find it does them good, makes them honest, and less disposed to cheat Indians, we will then consider again of what you have said.

Brother: You have now heard our answer to your talk, and this is all we have to say at present. As we are going to part, we will come and take you by the hand, and hope the Great Spirit will protect you on your journey, and return you safe to your friends.

JOHN J. INGALLS

(1833–)

DURING his service in the United States Senate, John J. Ingalls, of Kansas, was one of the readiest debaters and most fluent speakers of that body. During the closing years of the Reconstruction Period, he was denounced for "shaking the bloody shirt," and by some was considered a bitter partisan. All who understood him, however, knew him to be a man of genial disposition, who felt no malice whatever towards those whom he so strongly attacked. He frequently showed his natural kindness of heart, as well as his eloquence, in funeral orations over his departed political opponents. That over Benjamin H. Hill, of Georgia, here reproduced from the Congressional Record, has become famous and is likely to survive as one of the classics of oratory.

Mr. Ingalls was born at Middleton, Massachusetts, December 29th, 1833. He removed to Kansas in 1858, and for a full generation was one of the greatest forces in Western politics. He represented Kansas in the United States Senate for eighteen years, and from 1889 to 1891 he was speaker *pro tempore* of that body.

THE UNDISCOVERED COUNTRY

(Delivered in the Senate, January 25th, 1883, on the Death of Benjamin H. Hill)

BEN HILL has gone to the undiscovered country. Whether his journey thither was but one step across an imperceptible frontier, or whether an interminable ocean, black, unfluctuating, and voiceless, stretches between these earthly coasts and those invisible shores — we do not know.

Whether on that August morning after death he saw a more glorious sun rise with unimaginable splendor above a celestial horizon, or whether his apathetic and unconscious ashes still sleep in cold obstruction and insensible oblivion — we do not know.

Whether his strong and subtle energies found instant exercise in another forum, whether his dexterous and disciplined faculties are now contending in a higher senate than ours for supremacy,

or whether his powers were dissipated and dispersed with his parting breath — we do not know.

Whether his passions, ambitions, and affections still sway, attract, and impel, whether he yet remembers us as we remember him — we do not know.

These are the unsolved, the insoluble problems of mortal life and human destiny, which prompted the troubled patriarch to ask that momentous question for which the centuries have given no answer,—"If a man die, shall he live again?"

Every man is the centre of a circle whose fatal circumference he cannot pass. Within its narrow confines he is potential, beyond it he perishes; and if immortality is a splendid but delusive dream, if the incompleteness of every career, even the longest and most fortunate, be not supplemented and perfected after its termination here, then he who dreads to die should fear to live, for life is a tragedy more desolate and inexplicable than death.

Of all the dead whose obsequies we have paused to solemnize in this Chamber, I recall no one whose untimely fate seems so lamentable and yet so rich in prophecy as that of Senator Hill. He had reached the meridian of his years. He stood upon the high plateau of middle life, in that serene atmosphere where temptation no longer assails, where the clamorous passions no more distract, and where the conditions are most favorable for noble and enduring achievement. His upward path had been through stormy adversity and contention such as infrequently falls to the lot of men. Though not without the tendency to meditation, reverie, and introspection which accompanies genius, his temperament was palestric. He was competitive and unpeaceful. He was born a polemic and controversialist, intellectually pugnacious and combative, so that he was impelled to defend any position that might be assailed or to attack any position that might be intrenched, not because the defense or the assault were essential, but because the positions were maintained and that those who held them became by that fact alone his adversaries. This tendency of his nature made his orbit erratic. He was meteoric rather than planetary, and flashed with irregular splendor rather than shone with steady and penetrating rays. His advocacy of any cause was fearless to the verge of temerity. He appeared to be indifferent to applause or censure for their own sake. He accepted intrepidly any conclusions that he reached, without inquiring whether they were politic or expedient.

To such a spirit partisanship was unavoidable, but with Senator Hill it did not degenerate into bigotry. He was capable of broad generosity, and extended to his opponents the same unreserved candor which he demanded for himself. His oratory was impetuous and devoid of artifice. He was not a posturer or phrasemonger. He was too intense, too earnest, to employ the cheap and paltry decorations of discourse. He never reconnoitred a hostile position, nor approached it by stealthy parallels. He could not lay siege to an enemy, nor beleaguer him; nor open trenches, and sap and mine. His method was the charge and the onset. He was the Murat of senatorial debate. Not many men of this generation have been better equipped for parliamentary warfare than he, with his commanding presence, his sinewy diction, his confidence, and imperturbable self-control.

But in the maturity of his powers and his fame, with unmeasured opportunities for achievement apparently before him, with great designs unaccomplished, surrounded by the proud and affectionate solicitude of a great constituency, the pallid messenger with the inverted torch beckoned him to depart. There are few scenes in history more tragic than that protracted combat with death. No man had greater inducements to live. But in the long struggle against the inexorable advances of an insidious and mortal malady, he did not falter nor repine. He retreated with the aspect of a victor; and though he succumbed, he seemed to conquer. His sun went down at noon, but it sank amid the prophetic splendors of an eternal dawn.

With more than a hero's courage, with more than a martyr's fortitude, he waited the approach of the inevitable hour and went to the undiscovered country.

ROBERT G. INGERSOLL

(1833–1899)

T is said of Isocrates among Athenian orators that he was "the first who perfected prose rhythm." It is so hard to read Attic Greek with even an approximation to the musical "time" in which Isocrates wrote it that those who wish to realize the meaning of this significant compliment to his style will do well to study the rhythms of Robert Green Ingersoll — of whom among American orators it may be said as truly as of Isocrates among the Greek, that he first perfected the prose rhythms of the language in which he expressed himself. Indeed, his ear for musical "time" is so nearly that of a poet, that many of his most eloquent passages have only to be divided and capitalized properly to become blank verse, governed by recurrent vowels as are the hexameters of Homer, the pentameters of the Greek tragedians, or the odes of Pindar. Colonel Ingersoll was born at Dresden, New York, August 11th, 1833. Removing to Peoria, Illinois, in 1857, he practiced law until 1862, when he entered the volunteer service as Colonel of the Eleventh Illinois Cavalry. He became Attorney-General of Illinois in 1866, and so great was public admiration for his oratory that he might have commanded any office in the gift of the people of the State had he not chosen to devote his great talents to theological controversy. He is most celebrated for his lectures attacking theological tenets which displeased him, but his speeches in political conventions and at the bar illustrate the same remarkable qualities he showed on the platform. He was a man of extensive reading, typically American in his entire freedom from any approach to social aloofness. He was popular as an orator, primarily, because he felt the unity of his own mind, both in its strength and in its weaknesses, with the average mind of the average American community. His greatest strength lies less in severity of thought, less in the piling up of idea on idea, fact on fact, than in a compelling power of musical expression, voicing his own emotions, and appealing to the related emotions of his hearers through their sense of the harmonies of language. In the ability to do this, he has not been equaled by any other American orator. He died July 21st, 1899. His "Plumed-Knight" speech, here given in full from an authorized text, is probably the most celebrated speech ever made in an American convention.

[All the selections following are made by permission of Colonel Ingersoll's family from the authorized text in 'Prose Poems and Selections from the Writings and Sayings of Robert G. Ingersoll.' Copyright: C. P. Farrell, Publisher, New York City, 1895.]

BLAINE, THE PLUMED KNIGHT

(Speech Nominating Blaine for President in the Republican National Convention at Cincinnati, June 15th, 1876)

MASSACHUSETTS may be satisfied with the loyalty of Benjamin H. Bristow; so am I; but if any man nominated by this convention cannot carry the State of Massachusetts, I am not satisfied with the loyalty of that State. If the nominee of this convention cannot carry the grand old Commonwealth of Massachusetts by seventy-five thousand majority, I would advise them to sell out Faneuil Hall as a Democratic headquarters. I would advise them to take from Bunker Hill that old monument of glory.

The Republicans of the United States demand as their leader in the great contest of 1876 a man of intelligence, a man of integrity, a man of well-known and approved political opinions. They demand a statesman; they demand a reformer after, as well as before, the election. They demand a politician in the highest, broadest, and best sense — a man of superb moral courage. They demand a man acquainted with public affairs — with the wants of the people — with not only the requirements of the hour, but with the demands of the future. They demand a man broad enough to comprehend the relations of this government to the other nations of the earth. They demand a man well versed in the powers, duties, and prerogatives of each and every department of this Government. They demand a man who will sacredly preserve the financial honor of the United States — one who knows enough to know that the national debt must be paid through the prosperity of this people; one who knows enough to know that all the financial theories in the world cannot redeem a single dollar; one who knows enough to know that all the money must be made, not by law, but by labor; one who knows enough to know that the people of the United States have the industry to make the money and the honor to pay it over just as fast as they make it.

The Republicans of the United States demand a man who knows that prosperity and resumption, when they come, must come together; that when they come they will come hand in hand through the golden harvest fields; hand in hand by the whirling spindles and turning wheels; hand in hand past the open furnace doors; hand in hand by the flaming forges; hand in hand by the chimneys filled with eager fire — greeted and grasped by the countless sons of toil.

This money has to be dug out of the earth. You cannot make it by passing resolutions in a political convention.

The Republicans of the United States want a man who knows that this Government should protect every citizen at home and abroad; who knows that any government that will not defend its defenders and protect its protectors is a disgrace to the map of the world. They demand a man who believes in the eternal separation and divorcement of church and school. They demand a man whose political reputation is spotless as a star; but they do not demand that their candidate shall have a certificate of moral character signed by a Confederate Congress. The man who has in full, heaped and rounded measure, all these splendid qualifications is the present grand and gallant leader of the Republican party — James G. Blaine.

Our country, crowned with the vast and marvelous achievements of its first century, asks for a man worthy of the past and prophetic of her future; asks for a man who has the audacity of genius; asks for a man who is the grandest combination of heart, conscience, and brain beneath her flag. Such a man is James G. Blaine.

For the Republican host, led by this intrepid man, there can be no defeat.

This is a grand year; a year filled with the recollections of the Revolution, filled with proud and tender memories of the past, with the sacred legends of liberty; a year in which the sons of freedom will drink from the fountains of enthusiasm; a year in which the people call for a man who has preserved in Congress what our soldiers won upon the field; a year in which we call for the man who has torn from the throat of treason the tongue of slander — for the man who has snatched the mask of Democracy from the hideous face of Rebellion — for the man who, like an intellectual athlete, has stood in the arena of debate

and challenged all comers, and who, up to the present moment, is a total stranger to defeat.

Like an armed warrior, like a plumed knight, James G. Blaine marched down the halls of the American Congress and threw his shining lance full and fair against the brazen foreheads of the defamers of his country and the maligners of his honor. For the Republicans to desert this gallant leader now is as though an army should desert their General upon the field of battle.

James G. Blaine is now, and has been for years, the bearer of the sacred standard of the Republican party. I call it sacred, because no human being can stand beneath its folds without becoming and without remaining free.

Gentlemen of the convention, in the name of the great republic, the only republic that ever existed upon this earth; in the name of all her defenders and of all her supporters; in the name of all her soldiers living; in the name of all her soldiers dead upon the field of battle; and in the name of those who perished in the skeleton clutch of famine at Andersonville and Libby, whose sufferings he so vividly remembers, Illinois — Illinois nominates for the next President of this country that prince of parliamentarians, that leader of leaders, James G. Blaine.

ORATION AT HIS BROTHER'S GRAVE

(Delivered at the Funeral of His Brother, Ebon C. Ingersoll, in Washington, June 3d, 1879)

FRIENDS, I am going to do that which the dead oft promised he would do for me.

The loved and loving brother, husband, father, friend died, where manhood's morning almost touches noon, and while the shadows still were falling toward the West.

He has not passed on life's highway the stone that marks the highest point, but, being weary for a moment, he lay down by the wayside, and, using his burden for a pillow, fell into that dreamless sleep that kisses down his eyelids still. While yet in love with life and raptured with the world, he passed to silence and pathetic dust.

Yet, after all, it may be best, just in the happiest, sunniest hour of all the voyage, while eager winds are kissing every sail,

to dash against the unseen rock, and in an instant hear the billows roar above a sunken ship. For, whether in mid sea or 'mong the breakers of the farther shore, a wreck at last must mark the end of each and all. And every life, no matter if its every hour is rich with love and every moment jeweled with a joy, will, at its close, become a tragedy as sad and deep and dark as can be woven of the warp and woof of mystery and death.

This brave and tender man in every storm of life was oak and rock, but in the sunshine he was vine and flower. He was the friend of all heroic souls. He climbed the heights and left all superstitions far below, while on his forehead fell the golden dawning of the grander day.

He loved the beautiful, and was with color, form, and music touched to tears. He sided with the weak, the poor, and wronged, and lovingly gave alms. With loyal heart, and with the purest hands, he faithfully discharged all public trusts.

He was a worshiper of liberty, a friend of the oppressed. A thousand times I have heard him quote these words: "For justice all place a temple, and all season, summer." He believed that happiness was the only good, reason the only torch, justice the only worship, humanity the only religion, and love the only priest. He added to the sum of human joy; and were every one to whom he did some loving service to bring a blossom to his grave, he would sleep to-night beneath a wilderness of flowers.

Life is a narrow vale between the cold and barren peaks of two eternities. We strive in vain to look beyond the heights. We cry aloud, and the only answer is the echo of our wailing cry. From the voiceless lips of the unreplying dead, there comes no word; but in the night of death hope sees a star, and listening love can hear the rustle of the wing.

He who sleeps here, when dying, mistaking the approach of death for the return of health, whispered with his latest breath: "I am better now." Let us believe, in spite of doubts and dogmas, of fears and tears, that these dear words are true of all the countless dead.

And now to you who have been chosen, from among the many men he loved, to do the last sad office for the dead, we give his sacred dust.

A PICTURE OF WAR

(From an Address Delivered at the Soldiers' Reunion at Indianapolis, September 21st, 1876)

THE past rises before me like a dream. Again we are in the great struggle for national life. We hear the sounds of preparation — the music of boisterous drums — the silver voices of heroic bugles. We see thousands of assemblages, and hear the appeals of orators; we see the pale cheeks of women and the flushed faces of men; and in those assemblages we see all the dead whose dust we have covered with flowers. We lose sight of them no more. We are with them when they enlist in the great army of freedom. We see them part with those they love. Some are walking for the last time in quiet woody places with the maidens they adore. We hear the whisperings and the sweet vows of eternal love as they lingeringly part forever. Others are bending over cradles, kissing babes that are asleep. Some are receiving the blessings of old men. Some are parting with mothers, who hold them and press them to their hearts again and again, and say nothing; and some are talking with wives, and endeavoring with brave words spoken in the old tones to drive from their hearts the awful fear. We see them part. We see the wife standing in the door with the babe in her arms — standing in the sunlight sobbing; at the turn of the road a hand waves; she answers by holding high in her loving hands the child. He is gone, and forever.

We see them all as they march proudly away under the flaunting flags, keeping time to the wild, grand music of war — marching down the streets of the great cities, through the towns and across the prairies — down to the fields of glory, to do and to die for the eternal right.

We go with them, one and all. We are by their side on all the gory fields — in all the hospitals of pain — on all the weary marches. We stand guard with them in the wild storm and under the quiet stars. We are with them in ravines running with blood — in the furrows of old fields. We are with them between contending hosts, unable to move, wild with thirst, the life ebbing slowly away among the withered leaves. We see them pierced by balls and torn with shells, in the trenches by forts, and in the whirlwind of the charge, where men become iron, with nerves of steel.

We are with them in the prisons of hatred and famine; but human speech can never tell what they endured.

We are at home when the news comes that they are dead. We see the maiden in the shadow of her first sorrow. We see the silvered head of the old man bowed with the last grief.

The past rises before us, and we see four millions of human beings governed by the lash; we see them bound hand and foot; we hear the strokes of cruel whips; we see the hounds tracking women through tangled swamps; we see babes sold from the breasts of mothers. Cruelty unspeakable! Outrage infinite!

Four million bodies in chains — four million souls in fetters! All the sacred relations of wife, mother, father, and child trampled beneath the brutal feet of might! And all this was done under our own beautiful banner of the free.

The past rises before us. We hear the roar and shriek of the bursting shell. The broken fetters fall. These heroes died. We look. Instead of slaves, we see men and women and children. The wand of progress touches the auction block, the slave pen, the whipping post, and we see homes and firesides, and schoolhouses and books; and where all was want and crime and cruelty and fetters, we see the faces of the free.

These heroes are dead. They died for liberty — they died for us. They are at rest. They sleep in the land they made free, under the flag they rendered stainless, under the solemn pines, the sad hemlocks, the tearful willows, and the embracing vines. They sleep beneath the shadows of the clouds, careless alike of the sunshine or of storm, each in the windowless palace of rest. Earth may run red with other wars — they are at peace. In the midst of battle, in the roar of conflict, they found the serenity of death. [A voice — "Glory!"] I have one sentiment for the soldiers, living and dead — cheers for the living and tears for the dead.

THE GRAVE OF NAPOLEON

(From an Address 'The Liberty of Man, Woman, and Child')

A LITTLE while ago, I stood by the grave of the old Napoleon — a magnificent tomb of gilt and gold, fit almost for a dead deity — and gazed upon the sarcophagus of black Egyptian marble, where rest at last the ashes of that restless man. I

leaned over the balustrade and thought about the career of the greatest soldier of the modern world.

I saw him walking upon the banks of the Seine, contemplating suicide. I saw him at Toulon — I saw him putting down the mob in the streets of Paris — I saw him at the head of the army of Italy — I saw him crossing the bridge of Lodi with the tricolor in his hand — I saw him in Egypt in the shadow of the Pyramids — I saw him conquer the Alps and mingle the eagles of France with the eagles of the crags. I saw him at Marengo — at Ulm and Austerlitz. I saw him in Russia, where the infantry of the snow and the cavalry of the wild blast scattered his legions like winter's withered leaves. I saw him at Leipsic in defeat and disaster — driven by a million bayonets back upon Paris — clutched like a wild beast — banished to Elba. I saw him escape and retake an empire by the force of his genius. I saw him upon the frightful field of Waterloo, where Chance and Fate combined to wreck the fortunes of their former king. And I saw him at St. Helena, with his hands crossed behind him, gazing out upon the sad and solemn sea.

I thought of the orphans and widows he had made — of the tears that had been shed for his glory, and of the only woman who ever loved him, pushed from his heart by the cold hand of ambition. And I said I would rather have been a French peasant and worn wooden shoes. I would rather have lived in a hut with a vine growing over the door, and the grapes growing purple in the kisses of the autumn sun. I would rather have been that poor peasant with my loving wife by my side, knitting as the day died out of the sky — with my children upon my knees and their arms about me. I would rather have been that man and gone down to the tongueless silence of the dreamless dust than to have been that imperial impersonation of force and murder.

It is not necessary to be great to be happy; it is not necessary to be rich to be just and generous and to have a heart filled with divine affection. No matter whether you are rich or poor, treat your wife as though she were a splendid flower, and she will fill your life with perfume and with joy.

And do you know, it is a splendid thing to think that the woman you really love will never grow old to you. Through the wrinkles of time, through the mask of years, if you really love her, you will always see the face you loved and won. And a

woman who really loves a man does not see that he grows old; he is not decrepit to her; he does not tremble; he is not old; she always sees the same gallant gentleman who won her hand and heart. I like to think of it in that way; I like to think that love is eternal. And to love in that way and then go down the hill of life together, and as you go down, hear, perhaps, the laughter of grandchildren, while the birds of joy and love sing once more in the leafless branches of the tree of age.

I believe in the fireside. I believe in the democracy of home. I believe in the republicanism of the family. I believe in liberty, equality, and love.

THE IMAGINATION

The man of imagination,—that is to say, of genius,—having seen a leaf and a drop of water, can construct the forests, the rivers, and the seas. In his presence all the cataracts fall and foam, the mists rise, the clouds form and float.

Really to know one fact is to know its kindred and its neighbors. Shakespeare looking at a coat of mail, instantly imagined the society, the conditions that produced it, and what it produced. He saw the castle, the moat, the drawbridge, the lady in the tower, and the knightly lover spurring over the plain. He saw the bold baron and the rude retainer, the trampled serf, and all the glory and the grief of feudal life.

The man of imagination has lived the life of all people, of all races. He was a citizen of Athens in the days of Pericles; listened to the eager eloquence of the great orator, and sat upon the cliff and with the tragic poet heard "the multitudinous laughter of the sea." He saw Socrates thrust the spear of question through the shield and heart of falsehood; was present when the great man drank hemlock and met the night of death as tranquilly as a star meets morning. He has followed the peripatetic philosophers, and has been puzzled by the sophists. He has watched Phidias as he chiseled shapeless stone to forms of love and awe.

He has lived by the slow Nile amid the vast and monstrous. He knows the very thought that wrought the form and features of the Sphinx. He has heard great Memnon's morning song—has lain him down with the embalmed and waiting dead, and

felt within their dust the expectation of another life mingled with cold and suffocating doubts — the children born of long delay.

He has walked the ways of mighty Rome, has seen great Cæsar with his legions in the field, has stood with vast and motley throngs and watched the triumphs given to victorious men, followed by uncrowned kings, the captured hosts, and all the spoils of ruthless war. He has heard the shout that shook the Coliseum's roofless walls when from the reeling gladiator's hand the short sword fell, while from his bosom gushed the stream of wasted life.

He has lived the life of savage man, has trod the forest's silent depths, and in the desperate game of life or death has matched his thought against the instinct of the beast.

He knows all crimes and all regrets, all virtues and their rich rewards. He has been victim and victor, pursuer and pursued, outcast and king — has heard the applauses and curses of the world, and on his heart have fallen all the nights and noons of failure and success.

He knows the unspoken thoughts, the dumb desires, the wants and ways of beasts. He has felt the crouching tiger's thrill, the terror of the ambushed prey, and with the eagles he has shared ecstacy of flight and poise and swoop, and he has lain with sluggish serpents on the barren rocks, uncoiling slowly in the heat of noon.

He has sat beneath the bo tree's contemplative shade, rapt in Buddha's mighty thought; and he has dreamed all dreams that Light, the alchemist, hath wrought from dust and dew and stored within the slumbrous poppy's subtle blood.

He has knelt with awe and dread at every shrine, has offered every sacrifice and every prayer, has felt the consolation and the shuddering fear, has seen all devils, has mocked and worshiped all the gods — enjoyed all heavens, and felt the pangs of every hell.

He has lived all lives, and through his blood and brain have crept the shadow and the chill of every death; and his soul, Mazeppa-like, has been lashed naked to the wild horse of every fear and love and hate.

The imagination hath a stage within the brain, whereon he sets all scenes that lie between the morn of laughter and the night of tears, and where his players body forth the false and true, the joys and griefs, the careless shallows, and the tragic deeps of every life.

LIFE

Born of love and hope, of ecstasy and pain, of agony and fear, of tears and joy — dowered with the wealth of two united hearts — held in happy arms, with lips upon life's drifted font, blue-veined and fair, where perfect peace finds perfect form — rocked by willing feet and wooed to shadowy shores of sleep by siren mother, singing soft and low — looking with wonder's wide and startled eyes at common things of life and day — taught by want and wish and contact with the things that touch the dimpled flesh of babes — lured by light and flame, and charmed by color's wondrous robes — learning the use of hands and feet, and by the love of mimicry beguiled to utter speech — releasing prisoned thoughts from crabbed and curious marks on soiled and tattered leaves — puzzling the brain with crooked numbers and their changing, tangled worth — and so through years of alternating day and night, until the captive grows familiar with the chains and walls and limitations of a life.

And time runs on in sun and shade, until the one of all the world is wooed and won, and all the lore of love is taught and learned again. Again a home is built, with the fair chamber wherein faint dreams, like cool and shadowy vales, divide the billowed hours of love. Again the miracle of a birth — the pain and joy, the kiss of welcome and the cradle song, drowning the drowsy prattle of a babe.

And then the sense of obligation and of wrong — pity for those who toil and weep — tears for the imprisoned and despised — love for the generous dead, and in the heart the rapture of a high resolve.

And then ambition, with its lust of pelf and place and power, longing to put upon its breast distinction's worthless badge. Then keener thoughts of men, and eyes that see behind the smiling mask of craft — flattered no more by the obsequious cringe of gain and greed — knowing the uselessness of hoarded gold, of honor bought from those who charge the usury of self-respect, of power that only bends a coward's knees and forces from the lips of fear the lies of praise. Knowing at last the unstudied gesture of esteem, the reverent eyes made rich with honest thought, and holding high above all other things — high as hope's great throbbing star above the darkness of the dead — the love of wife and child and friend.

Then locks of gray, and growing love of other days and half-remembered things — then holding withered hands of those who first held his, while over dim and loving eyes death softly presses down the lids of rest.

And so, locking in marriage vows his children's hands and crossing others on the breasts of peace, with daughters' babes upon his knees, the white hair mingling with the gold, he journeys on from day to day to that horizon where the dusk is waiting for the night. At last, sitting by the holy hearth of home as evening's embers change from red to gray, he falls asleep within the arms of her he worshiped and adored, feeling upon his pallid lips love's last and holiest kiss.

ISOCRATES

(436–338 B. C.)

ISOCRATES composed his orations to be read by others, or as models not intended to be delivered at all. It is assumed by Mahaffy and others that he was too bashful to appear in public and deliver his own orations. Mahaffy speaks of his "egregious vanity," and says that "he aspired to the position of a Swift or a Junius, with the talents of an Addison or a Pope." If we may take it for granted that he had the talents of "an Addison or a Pope," it will be sufficient to commend his oratory to attentive consideration, regardless of his actual or imaginary weaknesses of character.

Born at Athens, 436 B. C., he "lived through three of the most eventful generations of Greek history," dying in 338. As he was by profession a teacher of oratory rather than a politician, it is possible to imagine that, in some cases at least, composing political speeches which he failed to deliver publicly may have been as much an incident of professional convenience as of "egregious vanity" or bashfulness. About twenty-one of his orations are still extant. He was noted chiefly as a master of style.

The translation of J. H. Freese, of St. John's College, Cambridge, is here used for the 'Areopagiticus,' an oration made memorable by Milton's imitation of it. Probably it influenced Jefferson in forming the theories of government which he embodied in his first Inaugural Address, and on this account is more important to American students than the 'Panegyric' usually read in schools.

'AREOPAGITICUS'—"A FEW WISE LAWS WISELY ADMINISTERED"

(From the Areopagitic Oration Written to Persuade Athens to Return to the Constitution of Solon)

I THINK many of you wonder whatever is the idea that has led me to come forward to speak concerning the public safety, as if the city were in peril, or its affairs in a dangerous condition, instead of being the owner of more than two hundred triremes, at peace in Attica and the neighborhood, mistress of the sea, and still in a position to command the support of many

allies who will be ready to assist us in time of need, and of a still larger number who pay contributions and obey our orders; while we possess all these advantages, one would say that we might reasonably be of good courage as being out of reach of danger, and that it is rather our enemies who ought to be afraid and to take counsel for their own safety.

I know well that you, adopting this line of argument, despise my appearance here, and expect to maintain your authority over the whole of Greece with your present resources; whereas this is just the reason why I am afraid. For I see that those cities which think they are most prosperous adopt the worst counsels, and that those which feel the greatest confidence fall into the greatest dangers. The reason of this is, that no good or evil falls to the lot of man by itself alone, but, while wealth and power are attended and followed by want of sense, accompanied by license, want and a humble position bring with them prudence and moderation, so that it is hard to decide which of these two lots one would prefer to leave as a legacy to his children. For we should find that, starting from that which seems to be worse, things generally improve; while, as the result of that which is apparently better, they usually deteriorate. . . .

A city's soul is nothing else but its political principle, which has as great influence as understanding in a man's body. For this it is that counsels concerning everything, and, while preserving prosperity, avoids misfortune. It is this that laws, orators, and individuals must naturally resemble, and fare according to the principles they hold. We, however, pay no heed to its destruction, and give no thought how we shall recover it; but, sitting in our shops, we abuse the present constitution, and assert that we were never worse governed under a democracy, while in our acts and thoughts we show ourselves more attached to it than to that bequeathed to us by our ancestors. It is on behalf of the latter that I propose to speak, and have given notice in writing of my intention to do so. For I see that this will be the only means of averting future dangers and getting rid of our present evils, if, namely, we be willing to restore that democracy which Solon, the devoted friend of the people, introduced, and which Cleisthenes, who drove out the despots and restored the rights of the people, re-established in its original form. We should not find a constitution more favorable to the people or more beneficial to the State than that. The strongest proof

whereof is that those who lived under it, having wrought many noble deeds and gained universal renown, received the headship from the Hellenes of their own free will, while those who are enamored of the present constitution, hated by all, after having undergone dreadful sufferings, have only just escaped being involved in the direst calamities. Surely it cannot be right to acquiesce in or be content with this constitution, which has been the cause of so many evils in former times, and is now every year growing worse. Ought we not rather to fear that if our misfortunes increase to such an extent, we may at last run aground upon more grievous troubles than those that then befell us?

In order that you may make your choice and decide between the two Constitutions, not merely after having heard a general statement, but from accurate knowledge, it is your duty to give your earnest attention to what I say, while I endeavor, as briefly as possible, to give you an account of both.

Those who conducted the affairs of the city at that time [the time of Solon] established a constitution that was not merely in name most mild and impartial, while in reality it did not show itself such to those who lived under it,—a constitution that did not train its citizens in such a manner that they considered license democracy, lawlessness liberty, insolence of speech equality, and the power of acting in this manner happiness, but which, by hating and punishing men of such character, made all the citizens better and more modest. And what chiefly assisted them in managing the State aright was this: of the two recognized principles of equality, the one assigning the same to all, the other their due to individuals, they were not ignorant which was the more useful, but rejected as unjust that which considered that good and bad had equal claims, and preferred that which honored and punished each man according to his deserts; and governed the State on these principles, not appointing magistrates from the general body of citizens by lot, but selecting the best and most capable to fill each office. For they hoped that the rest of the citizens would behave themselves like those at the head of affairs. In the next place, they thought that this method of appointing to office was more to the advantage of the people than appointment by lot, since, in appointing by lot, chance would have the decision, and supporters of oligarchy would often obtain offices, while, in selecting the most respectable citizens, the people

would be able to choose those who were most favorably disposed towards the established constitution. And the reason why the majority were contented with this arrangement, and why public offices were not objects of contention, was that they had learned to work and economize, and not to neglect their own property while entertaining designs on that of others, nor again to supply their own needs at the expense of the public funds, but rather to assist the treasury, if necessary, out of their own means, and not to have a more accurate knowledge of the income arising from public offices than of that produced by their own property. So severely did they keep their hands off the State revenues, that during those times it was harder to find men willing to undertake office than it is now to find men who have no desire for office at all; for they regarded the care of public affairs not as a lucrative business, but as a public charge, and they did not from the very day they took office consider whether the former holders of office had left anything to be gained, but rather whether they had neglected anything that pressed for a settlement. In short, they had made up their minds that the people, like an absolute master, ought to control the public offices, punish offenders and settle disputed points, and that those who were able to enjoy ease and possessed sufficient means should attend to public affairs like servants, and, if they acted justly, should be praised and rest contented with this recognition of their services, while, if they managed affairs badly, they should meet with no mercy, but should be visited with the severest penalties. And how would it be possible to find a democracy more just or more secure than one which set the most influential citizens at the head of public affairs, and at the same time invested the people with sovereign control over these same officials?

Such was the arrangement of the constitution adopted by them; and it is easy to understand from this that in their every-day life they always acted with uprightness and in accordance with the laws. For, when men have adopted right principles in regard to affairs in general, single departments of the same must of necessity resemble the whole. . . .

In a similar manner they behaved in their relations towards one another. For they were not only in accord upon public matters, but, in regard to their private life, they showed such consideration for one another as befits men of sense and members of one and the same Fatherland. Far from the poorer citi-

zens envying the richer, they were as anxious about the wealthy families as about their own, considering their prosperity to be a source of advantage to themselves; while those who were possessed of means, not only did not look down upon those who were in a humbler position, but, considering it disgraceful to themselves that the citizens should be in want, relieved their needs, handing over plots of land to some at a moderate rental, sending others out on business, and advancing capital to others for other occupations. For they were not afraid either of losing all, or with great difficulty recovering only a part of what had been lent, but felt as safe about the money put out as if it had been stored away at home. For they saw that those who decided claims for debt did not err on the side of leniency, but obeyed the laws, not making use of the suits of others in order to make it easy for them to act dishonestly themselves, but feeling more anger against those who cheated even than those who were themselves wronged, thinking that the poor sustained more injury than the rich by the act of those who did not faithfully observe their agreements; for the latter, if they were to give up lending money, would only lose a small portion of their income, while the former, if they should be without any to assist them, would be reduced to the greatest distress. Since all shared this opinion, no one either concealed the amount of his property or shrank from lending money, but all were more pleased to see borrowers than payers. For two things happened to them, which sensible men would desire: they both benefited their fellow-citizens and laid out their money to advantage. In short, as the result of their honorable social intercourse, their property was secured to those to whom it by right belonged, and the enjoyment of it was open to all the citizens who stood in need of it.

Perhaps someone may object to my statements that, while I praise the condition of affairs at that time, I give no explanation of the causes which made their relations amongst themselves so satisfactory and their administration of the city so successful; wherefore, although I think that I have already said something on this point, I will endeavor to give a fuller and clearer account of them. While in their early training they had many instructors, they were not allowed, when they reached manhood, to do as they pleased, but it was just in the prime of life that they were more carefully looked after than during their boyhood. For our ancestors paid such attention to virtue that they charged the

council of Areopagus with the maintenance of decorum, to the membership of which body only those were admitted who were of noble birth, and who had shown distinguished virtue and sobriety in their lives, so that naturally it stood before all the other assemblies of Hellas.

From what takes place at the present day, we may draw inferences concerning the institutions of that period; for even now, when everything connected with the election and scrutiny of magistrates is neglected, we should find that men, whose conduct in other respects is insufferable, when once they have become members of the Areopagus, shrink from following their natural bent, and conform to the regulations of the council rather than indulge their own vicious propensities — so great was the dread with which it inspired the vicious, and such the memorial of virtue and sobriety that it left behind in that place.

Such was the authority to which, as I have said, they intrusted the maintenance of good order, which considered that those were in error who imagined that a community, in which the laws were framed with the greatest exactness, produced the best men; for, if this were so, there would be nothing to prevent all the Hellenes being on the same level, so far as the facility of adopting one another's written laws is concerned. They, on the contrary, knew that virtue is not promoted by the laws, but by the habits of daily life, and that most people turn out men of like character to those in whose midst they have severally been brought up. For, where there are a number of laws drawn up with great exactitude, it is a proof that the city is badly administered; for the inhabitants are compelled to frame laws in great numbers as a barrier against offenses. Those, however, who are rightly governed should not cover the walls of the porticoes with copies of the laws, but preserve justice in their hearts; for it is not by decrees but by manners that cities are well governed, and, while those who have been badly brought up will venture to transgress laws drawn up even with the greatest exactitude, those who have been well educated will be ready to abide by laws framed in the simplest terms. With these ideas, they did not first consider how they should punish the disorderly, but by what means they should induce them to refrain from committing any offense deserving of punishment; for they considered that this was their mission, but that eagerness to inflict punishment was a matter of malevolence!

They were careful of the welfare of all the citizens, but especially the younger. For they saw that, at their time of life, they were most disposed to turbulence and full of desires, and that their minds needed to be specially trained and exercised in honorable pursuits and work accompanied by enjoyment, since those who have been brought up in a liberal spirit, and are accustomed to entertain high thoughts, would abide by these alone. It was impossible to direct all towards the same pursuits, as their positions in life were not the same; but they order them to follow occupations in conformity with their means. Those who were less well off than others they employed in agriculture and mercantile pursuits, knowing that want of means arises from idleness, and vicious habits from want of means: thus, by removing the source of these evils, they thought to keep them from the other offenses that follow in its train. . . .

Further, under the influence of that excellently ordered administration, the citizens were so trained to virtue that they did not injure one another, but fought and overcame all those who invaded their territory. With us it is quite the contrary, for we let no day pass without doing harm to one another, and have so neglected military matters that we cannot even bring ourselves to attend drill unless we receive pay. And — what is most important of all — at that time none of the citizens was in want of the necessaries of life, nor by asking alms from passers-by brought disgrace upon the city, whereas now the needy outnumber the well-to-do; so that we ought freely to excuse them, if they take no thought for the interests of the state, but only consider whence they are to procure their daily bread.

It is because I think that, if we follow the example of our forefathers, we shall both be rid of these evils and become the saviors, not only of the city, but of all the Hellenes, that I have come forward to speak and have said what I have; do you then, weighing all this carefully, vote for whatever seems to you likely to prove most conducive to the welfare of the state.

ANDREW JACKSON

(1767–1845)

ANDREW JACKSON succeeded John Quincy Adams in the Presidency as the result of the growing power of the States west of the Alleghany Mountains. From the adoption of the Constitution until the administration of John Quincy Adams, the choice of the Presidency was determined by the New England States and Virginia, with Pennsylvania and New York holding a balance of power, in using which they sought to control the Treasury and its policies as a recompense for conceding the honor of the Presidency to Virginia or New England. They had succeeded so well in this respect that when the balance of power passed to the West and was used to put an end to the joint control of Virginia and New England, the United States Bank, with its headquarters in Philadelphia, was so firmly established that no politician reasoning on the facts imagined it could be broken down. Jackson did break it down because he was not a politician and because, instead of reasoning on the facts to find rules of action, he was governed by his sympathy with the impulses and prejudices of the masses of the people. The eight years of his administration mark a distinct turning point in American politics, not only because of the great contest which broke down the bank's control of money, but because with his accession to the Presidency the Western States, feeling their power and asserting their right to be heard in the affairs of the Union, put an end to the «Colonial» period during which the country was controlled by the men who had rebelled against Great Britain and founded the new government. Although in many respects Jackson was identified with these, he stands for a new tradition and his politics are the politics of a later generation.

In the adjustment among the tripartite powers (New England, the Middle States, and Virginia as the representative of the South), New England was badly worsted during a considerable part of this period. The war with England, and the Embargo preceding it, demoralized New England trade. By careful political management, under Jackson, it was in a fair way to become flourishing again, when South Carolina, which had acquiesced in Virginia's leadership, broke away from Tennessee and attempted to force a complete realignment in national politics by threatening New England industries with its

doctrine of Nullification. Jackson's indignation was deep and heartfelt, and on December 11th, 1832, he issued against the Nullifiers the celebrated proclamation, which, without mentioning it or the occasion for it, he defends and explains in his second Inaugural Address. So important was the effect of his attitude on history that it may almost be said to have decided the result of the Civil War a quarter of a century before the fighting actually began.

Under Jackson the Government of the United States represented for the first time the Democracy of Numbers. Washington stood for control by wisdom and virtue; Jefferson for individual liberty and the utmost possible restriction of arbitrary power, whether in oligarchy or majority; and Jackson for the rule of the majority. Under him the question between "We the People" and "We the States," so strongly contested in making the Federal Constitution, was finally decided so fully and irretrievably that the decision, as he announced it in his second Inaugural, was merely confirmed at Appomattox.

SECOND INAUGURAL ADDRESS — STATE RIGHTS AND FEDERAL SOVEREIGNTY

(Delivered March 4th, 1833)

Fellow-Citizens: —

THE will of the American people, expressed through their unsolicited suffrages, calls me before you to pass through the solemnities preparatory to taking upon myself the duties of President of the United States for another term. For their approbation of my public conduct through a period which has not been without its difficulties, and for this renewed expression of their confidence in my good intentions, I am at a loss for terms adequate to the expression of my gratitude.

It shall be displayed to the extent of my humble abilities in continued efforts so to administer the Government as to preserve their liberty and promote their happiness.

So many events have occurred within the last four years which have necessarily called forth — sometimes under circumstances the most delicate and painful — my views of the principles and policy which ought to be pursued by the General Government that I need on this occasion but allude to a few leading considerations connected with some of them.

The foreign policy adopted by our Government soon after the formation of our present Constitution, and very generally pursued

by successive administrations, has been crowned with almost complete success, and has elevated our character among the nations of the earth. To do justice to all and to submit to wrong from none has been during my administration its governing maxim, and so happy have been its results that we are not only at peace with all the world, but have few causes of controversy, and those of minor importance remaining unadjusted.

In the domestic policy of this Government, there are two objects which especially deserve the attention of the people and their representatives, and which have been and will continue to be the subjects of my increasing solicitude. They are the preservation of the rights of the several States and the integrity of the Union.

These great objects are necessarily connected, and can only be attained by an enlightened exercise of the powers of each within its appropriate sphere, in conformity with the public will constitutionally expressed. To this end it becomes the duty of all to yield a ready and patriotic submission to the laws constitutionally enacted, and thereby promote and strengthen a proper confidence in those institutions of the several States and of the United States which the people themselves have ordained for their own government.

My experience in public concerns and the observation of a life somewhat advanced confirm the opinions long since imbibed by me, that the destruction of our State governments or the annihilation of their control over the local concerns of the people would lead directly to revolution and anarchy, and finally to despotism and military domination. In proportion, therefore, as the General Government encroaches upon the rights of the States, in the same proportion does it impair its own power and detract from its ability to fulfill the purposes of its creation. Solemnly impressed with these considerations, my countrymen will ever find me ready to exercise my constitutional powers in arresting measures which may directly or indirectly encroach upon the rights of the States or tend to consolidate all political power in the General Government. But of equal, and, indeed, of incalculable importance is the union of these States, and the sacred duty of all to contribute to its preservation by a liberal support of the General Government in the exercise of its just powers. You have been wisely admonished to "accustom yourselves to think and speak of the Union as of the palladium of your political safety

and prosperity, watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety, discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned, and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of any attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts." Without union our independence and liberty would never have been achieved; without union they never can be maintained. Divided into twenty-four, or even a smaller number, of separate communities, we shall see our internal trade burdened with numberless restraints and exactions; communication between distant points and sections obstructed or cut off; our sons made soldiers to deluge with blood the fields they now till in peace; the mass of our people borne down and impoverished by taxes to support armies and navies, and military leaders at the head of their victorious legions becoming our lawgivers and judges. The loss of liberty, of all good government, of peace, plenty, and happiness, must inevitably follow a dissolution of the Union. In supporting it, therefore, we support all that is dear to the freeman and the philanthropist.

The time at which I stand before you is full of interest. The eyes of all nations are fixed on our Republic. The event of the existing crisis will be decisive in the opinion of mankind of the practicability of our Federal system of Government. Great is the stake placed in our hands; great is the responsibility which must rest upon the people of the United States. Let us realize the importance of the attitude in which we stand before the world. Let us exercise forbearance and firmness. Let us extricate our country from the dangers which surround it, and learn wisdom from the lessons they inculcate.

Deeply impressed with the truth of these observations, and under the obligation of that solemn oath which I am about to take, I shall continue to exert all my faculties to maintain the just powers of the Constitution and to transmit unimpaired to posterity the blessings of our Federal Union. At the same time it will be my aim to inculcate by my official acts the necessity of exercising by the General Government those powers only that are clearly delegated; to encourage simplicity and economy in the expenditures of the Government; to raise no more money from the people than may be requisite for these objects, and in a manner that will best promote the interests of all classes of the community and of all portions of the Union. Constantly

bearing in mind that in entering into society "individuals must give up a share of liberty to preserve the rest," it will be my desire so to discharge my duties as to foster with our brethren in all parts of the country a spirit of liberal concession and compromise, and, by reconciling our fellow-citizens to those partial sacrifices which they must unavoidably make for the preservation of a greater good, to recommend our invaluable Government and Union to the confidence and affections of the American people.

Finally, it is my most fervent prayer to that Almighty Being before whom I now stand, and who has kept us in his hands from the infancy of our Republic to the present day, that he will so overrule all my intentions and actions, and inspire the hearts of my fellow-citizens that we may be preserved from dangers of all kinds and continue forever a united and happy people.

JOHN JAY

(1745–1829)

JOHN JAY, first Chief-Justice of the United States Supreme Court, was born at New York city, December 12th, 1745. He was active as a patriot during the opening of the struggle with Great Britain, and in 1774 was elected to Congress from New York. He served until 1779, when he was appointed Minister to Spain—an office he surrendered to go as Peace Commissioner to Paris. On his return to the United States, he was one of the contributors to the Federalist, and after the adoption of the Constitution he was appointed Chief-Justice of the United States—a position he held from 1789 to 1795. From 1794 to 1795 he was a special envoy to Great Britain and was instrumental in negotiating "Jay's Treaty," his connection with which was the most important single event of his life. After his return he was Governor of New York from 1795 to 1801. He died in Westchester County, New York, May 17th, 1829. The protest against England's colonial policy, prepared by him as an address to the people of England, is one of the landmarks in the advance of the principle of local self-government.

PROTEST AGAINST COLONIAL GOVERNMENT

(Read in Congress October 18th, 1774, Mr. Jay Having Been Appointed to Prepare It as an Address to the People of Great Britain—Approved by Congress October 21st)

Friends and Fellow-Subjects:—

WHEN a nation led to greatness by the hand of liberty, and possessed of all the glory that heroism, munificence, and humanity can bestow, descends to the ungrateful task of forging chains for her friends and children, and, instead of giving support to freedom, turns advocate for slavery and oppression, there is reason to suspect she has either ceased to be virtuous or been extremely negligent in the appointment of her rulers.

In almost every age, in repeated conflicts in long and bloody wars, as well civil as foreign, against many and powerful nations,

against the open assaults of enemies, and the more dangerous treachery of friends, have the inhabitants of your island, your great and glorious ancestors, maintained their independence and transmitted the rights of men and the blessings of liberty to you, their posterity.

Be not surprised, therefore, that we who are descended from the same common ancestors, that we whose forefathers participated in all the rights, the liberties, and the Constitution you so justly boast of, and who have carefully conveyed the same fair inheritance to us, guaranteed by the plighted faith of Government, and the most solemn compacts with British sovereigns, should refuse to surrender them to men who found their claims on no principles of reason, and who prosecute them with a design that, by having our lives and property in their power, they may, with the greatest facility, enslave you.

The cause of America is now the object of universal attention; it has at length become very serious. This unhappy country has not only been oppressed, but abused and misrepresented; and the duty we owe to ourselves and posterity, to your interest, and the general welfare of the British Empire, leads us to address you on this very important subject.

Know, then, that we consider ourselves, and do insist, that we are and ought to be as free as our fellow-subjects in Britain, and that no power on earth has a right to take our property from us without our consent.

That we claim all the benefits secured to the subject by the English Constitution, and particularly that inestimable one of trial by jury.

That we hold it essential to English liberty that no man be condemned unheard, or punished for supposed offenses, without having an opportunity of making his defense.

That we think the legislature of Great Britain is not authorized by the Constitution to establish a religion fraught with sanguinary and impious tenets; or to erect an arbitrary form of government in any quarter of the globe. These rights we, as well as you, deem sacred; and yet, sacred as they are, they have, with many others, been repeatedly and flagrantly violated.

Are not the proprietors of the soil of Great Britain lords of their own property? Can it be taken from them without their consent? Will they yield it to the arbitrary disposal of any man or number of men whatever? You know they will not.

Why, then, are the proprietors of the soil of America less lords of their property than you are of yours? or why should they submit it to the disposal of your Parliament, or any other parliament or council in the world, not of their election? Can the intervention of the sea that divides us cause disparity in rights, or can any reason be given why English subjects who live three thousand miles from the royal palace should enjoy less liberty than those who are three hundred miles distant from it?

Reason looks with indignation on such distinctions, and freemen can never perceive their propriety. And yet, however chimerical and unjust such discriminations are, the Parliament assert that they have a right to bind us, in all cases, without exception, whether we consent or not; that they may take and use our property when and in what manner they please; that we are pensioners on their bounty for all that we possess, and can hold it no longer than they vouchsafe to permit. Such declarations we consider as heresies in English politics, and which can no more operate to deprive us of our property than the interdicts of the Pope can divest kings of sceptres which the laws of the land and the voice of the people have placed in their hands.

At the conclusion of the late war — a war rendered glorious by the abilities and integrity of a minister to whose efforts the British empire owes its safety and its fame; at the conclusion of this war, which was succeeded by an inglorious peace, formed under the auspices of a minister of principles, and of a family, unfriendly to the Protestant cause, and inimical to liberty — we say at this period, and under the influence of that man, a plan for enslaving your fellow-subjects in America was concerted, and has ever since been pertinaciously carrying into execution.

Prior to this era you were content with drawing from us the wealth produced by our commerce; you restrained your trade in every way that could conduce to your emolument. You exercised unbounded sovereignty over the sea. You named the ports and nations to which alone our merchandise should be carried, and with whom alone we should trade; and though some of these restrictions were grievous, we nevertheless did not complain. We looked up to you as to our parent State, to which we were bound by the strongest ties, and were happy in being instrumental to your prosperity and your grandeur.

We call upon you yourselves to witness our loyalty and attachment to the common interest of the whole empire. Did we

not, in the last war, add all the strength of this vast continent to the force which repelled our common enemy? Did we not leave our native shores and meet disease and death to promote the success of British arms in foreign climates? Did you not thank us for our zeal, and even reimburse us large sums of money, which you confessed we had advanced beyond our proportion, and far beyond our abilities? You did.

To what causes, then, are we to attribute the sudden change of treatment and that system of slavery which was prepared for us at the restoration of peace?

Before we had recovered from the distresses which ever attend war, an attempt was made to drain this country of all its money by the oppressive Stamp Act. Paint, glass, and other commodities, which you would not permit us to purchase of other nations, were taxed; nay, although no wine is made in any country, subject to the British State, you prohibited our procuring it of foreigners without paying a tax imposed by your Parliament on all we imported. These, and many other impositions, were laid upon us, most unjustly and unconstitutionally, for the express purpose of raising a revenue. In order to silence complaint, it was indeed provided that this revenue should be expended in America for its protection and defense. These exactions, however, can receive no justification from a pretended necessity of protecting and defending us. They are lavishly squandered on court favorites and ministerial dependants, generally avowed enemies to America, and employing themselves by partial representations to traduce and embroil the Colonies. For the necessary support of government here, we ever were and ever shall be ready to provide. And whenever the exigencies of the State may require it, we shall, as we have heretofore done, cheerfully contribute our full proportion of men and money. To enforce this unconstitutional and unjust scheme of taxation, every fence that the wisdom of our British ancestors had carefully erected against arbitrary power has been violently thrown down in America, and the inestimable right of trial by jury taken away, in cases that touch both life and property. It was ordained that whenever offenses should be committed in the Colonies against particular acts, imposing various duties and restrictions upon trade, the prosecutor might bring his action for the penalties in the courts of admiralty, by which means the subject lost the advantage of being tried by an honest, uninfluenced jury of the vicinage, and was subjected to the sad

necessity of being judged by a single man, a creature of the Crown, and according to the course of a law which exempts the prosecutor from the trouble of proving his accusation, and obliges the defendant either to evince his innocence or to suffer. To give this new judicatory the greater importance, and as if with design to protect false accusers, it is further provided that the judge's certificate of there having been probable causes of seizure and prosecution shall protect the prosecutor from actions at common law for recovery of damages.

By the course of our law, offenses committed in such of the British dominions in which courts are established, and justice duly and regularly administered, shall be there tried by a jury of the vicinage. There the offenders and the witnesses are known, and the degree of credibility to be given to their testimony can be ascertained.

In all these Colonies justice is regularly and impartially administered; and yet, by the construction of some, and the direction of other acts of Parliament, offenders are to be taken by force, together with all such persons as may be pointed out as witnesses, and carried to England, there to be tried in a distant land by a jury of strangers, and subject to all the disadvantages that result from the want of friends, want of witnesses, and want of money.

When the design of raising a revenue from the duties imposed on the importation of tea into America had in great measure been rendered abortive by our ceasing to import that commodity, a scheme was concerted by the ministry with the East India Company, and an act passed, enabling and encouraging them to transport and vend it in the Colonies. Aware of the danger of giving success to this insidious manœuvre, and of permitting a precedent of taxation thus to be established among us, various methods were adopted to elude the stroke. The people of Boston, then ruled by a governor whom, as well as his predecessor, Sir Francis Bernard, all America considers as her enemy, were exceedingly embarrassed. The ships which had arrived with the tea were, by his management, prevented from returning. The duties would have been paid; the cargoes landed and exposed to sale; a governor's influence would have procured and protected many purchasers. While the town was suspended by deliberations on this important subject, the tea was destroyed. Even

supposing a trespass was thereby committed, and the proprietors of the tea entitled to damages, the courts of law were open, and judges, appointed by the Crown, presided in them. The East India Company, however, did not think proper to commence any suits, nor did they even demand satisfaction, either from individuals or from the community in general. The ministry, it seems, officiously made the case their own, and the great council of the nation descended to intermeddle with a dispute about private property. Divers papers, letters, and other unauthenticated *ex parte* evidence, were laid before them. Neither the persons who destroyed the tea, nor the people of Boston, were called upon to answer the complaint. The ministry, incensed by being disappointed in a favorite scheme, were determined to recur from the little arts of finesse to open force and unmanly violence. The port of Boston was blocked up by a fleet, and an army placed in the town. Their trade was to be suspended, and thousands reduced to the necessity of gaining subsistence from charity, till they should submit to pass under the yoke and consent to become slaves, by confessing the omnipotence of Parliament, and acquiescing in whatever disposition they might think proper to make of their lives and property.

Let justice and humanity cease to be the boast of your nation! Consult your history; examine your records of former transactions; nay, turn to the annals of the many arbitrary states and kingdoms that surround you, and show us a single instance of men being condemned to suffer for imputed crimes, unheard, unquestioned, and without even the specious formality of a trial; and that, too, by laws made expressly for the purpose, and which had no existence at the time of the act committed. If it be difficult to reconcile these proceedings to the genius and temper of your laws and Constitution, the task will become more arduous when we call upon our ministerial enemies to justify, not only condemning men untried and by hearsay, but involving the innocent in one common punishment with the guilty, and for the act of thirty or forty to bring poverty, distress, and calamity on thirty thousands souls, and those not your enemies, but your friends, brethren, and fellow-subjects.

It would be some consolation to us if the catalogue of American oppressions ended here. It gives us pain to be reduced to the necessity of reminding you that under the confidence reposed

in the faith of Government, pledged in a royal charter from a British sovereign, the forefathers of the present inhabitants of the Massachusetts Bay left their former habitations, and established that great, flourishing, and loyal Colony. Without incurring or being charged with a forfeiture of their rights, without being heard, without being tried, without law and without justice, by an act of Parliament their charter is destroyed, their liberties violated, their constitution and form of government changed; and all this upon no better pretense than because in one of their towns a trespass was committed on some merchandise, said to belong to one of the companies, and because the ministry were of opinion that such high political regulations were necessary to compel due subordination and obedience to their mandates.

Nor are these the only capital grievances under which we labor. We might tell of dissolute, weak, and wicked governors having been set over us; of legislatures being suspended for asserting the rights of British subjects; of needy and ignorant dependants on great men advanced to the seats of justice, and to other places of trust and importance; of hard restrictions on commerce, and a great variety of lesser evils, the recollection of which is almost lost under the weight and pressure of greater and more poignant calamities.

Now mark the progression of the ministerial plan for enslaving us.

Well aware that such hardy attempts to take our property from us; to deprive us of that valuable right of trial by jury; to seize our persons, and carry us for trial to Great Britain; to blockade our ports; to destroy our charters and change our forms of government; would occasion, and had already occasioned, great discontent in the Colonies, which might produce opposition to these measures, an act was passed to protect, indemnify, and screen from punishment such as might be guilty even of murder, in endeavoring to carry their oppressive edicts into execution; and by another act, the Dominion of Canada is to be so extended, modeled, and governed, as that, by being disunited from us, detached from our interests, by civil as well as religious prejudices; that by their numbers daily swelling with Catholic emigrants from Europe, and by their devotion to an administration so friendly to their religion, they might become formidable

to us, and on occasion be fit instruments, in the hands of power, to reduce the ancient free Protestant Colonies to the same state of slavery with themselves.

This was evidently the object of the act; and in this view, being extremely dangerous to our liberty and quiet, we cannot forbear complaining of it as hostile to British America. Superadded to these considerations, we cannot help deploring the unhappy condition to which it has reduced the many English settlers who, encouraged by the royal proclamation, promising the enjoyment of all their rights, have purchased estates in that country. They are now the subjects of an arbitrary government, deprived of trial by jury, and when imprisoned cannot claim the benefit of the Habeas Corpus Act — that great bulwark and palladium of English liberty. Nor can we suppress our astonishment that a British Parliament should ever consent to establish in that country a religion that has deluged your island in blood, and dispersed impiety, bigotry, persecution, murder, and rebellion through every part of the world.

This being a true state of facts, let us beseech you to consider to what end they may lead.

Admit that the ministry, by the powers of Britain and the aid of our Roman Catholic neighbors, should be able to carry the point of taxation, and reduce us to a state of perfect humiliation and slavery; such an enterprise would doubtless make some addition to your national debt, which already presses down your liberties and fills you with pensioners and placemen. We presume, also, that your commerce will be somewhat diminished. However, suppose you should prove victorious, in what condition will you then be? What advantages or laurels will you reap from such a conquest?

May not a ministry with the same armies enslave you? It may be said, you will cease to pay them — but remember the taxes from America, the wealth, and we may add the men, and particularly the Roman Catholics of this vast continent, will then be in the power of your enemies; nor will you have any reason to expect that after making slaves of us, many among us should refuse to assist in reducing you to the same abject state.

Do not treat this as chimerical. Know that in less than half a century the quit rents reserved to the Crown, from the numberless grants of this vast continent, will pour large streams of

wealth into the royal coffers, and if to this be added the power of taxing America at pleasure, the Crown will be rendered independent of you for supplies and will possess more treasure than may be necessary to purchase the remains of liberty in your island. In a word, take care that you do not fall into the pit that is preparing for us.

We believe there is yet much virtue, much justice, and much public spirit in the English nation. To that justice we now appeal. You have been told that we are seditious, impatient of government, and desirous of independency. Be assured that these are not facts, but calumnies. Permit us to be as free as yourselves, and we shall ever esteem a union with you to be our greatest glory, and our greatest happiness; we shall ever be ready to contribute all in our power to the welfare of the empire; we shall consider your enemies as our enemies, and your interest as our own.

But if you are determined that your ministers shall wantonly sport with the rights of mankind; if neither the voice of justice, the dictates of the law, the principles of the Constitution, nor the suggestions of humanity, can restrain your hands from shedding human blood in such an impious cause, we must then tell you that we will never submit to be hewers of wood or drawers of water for any ministry or nation in the world.

Place us in the same situation that we were in at the close of the last war, and our former harmony will be restored.

But lest the same supineness and the same inattention to our common interest which you have for several years shown, should continue, we think it prudent to anticipate the consequences.

By the destruction of the trade of Boston, the ministry have endeavored to induce submission to their measures. The like fate may befall us all. We will endeavor, therefore, to live without trade, and recur for subsistence to the fertility and bounty of our native soil, which will afford us all the necessaries and some of the conveniences of life. We have suspended our importation from Great Britain and Ireland, and, in less than a year's time, unless our grievances should be redressed, shall discontinue our exports to those kingdoms and the West Indies.

It is with the utmost regret, however, that we find ourselves compelled, by the overruling principles of self-preservation, to adopt measures detrimental in their consequences to numbers of

our fellow-subjects in Great Britain and Ireland. But we hope that the magnanimity and justice of the British nation will furnish a Parliament of such wisdom, independence, and public spirit as may save the violated rights of the whole empire from the devices of wicked ministers and evil counselors, whether in or out of office, and thereby restore that harmony, friendship, and fraternal affection between all the inhabitants of his Majesty's kingdoms and territories, so ardently wished for by every true and honest American.

THOMAS JEFFERSON

(1743–1826)

N HIS first Inaugural Address, Thomas Jefferson made a deliberate and remarkably successful attempt to condense his theories of government into a few easily-remembered sentences. The Inaugural ranks with the Declaration of Independence as his greatest work. Whether it is considered as an oration or a State paper, it is equally remarkable, constituting, as it does, a class of its own, because of its comprehensive definitions of principles which, until he thus defined them, had been felt chiefly as impulses. Although Jefferson was not an orator, although public speaking was very distasteful to him, it may be said with truth that on succeeding John Adams in 1801, after the revolutionary defeat of the Federalists in 1800, he delivered an address of greater historical importance than that of Demosthenes on the Crown, or of Burke opening the bribery charges at the trial of Warren Hastings, though the one is celebrated as the greatest oration of ancient, and the other of modern times.

Wonderfully compact as the address is in its condensation of the details of "Jeffersonian Democracy," the whole of it is really an elaboration of the principle expressed in the single sentence: "Still one thing more, fellow-citizens, a wise and frugal government which shall restrain men from injuring one another and leave them otherwise free."

This is the sum of Jefferson's theory of government. He believed that in order to have the utmost possible progress through the increase of peace, order, and mutual helpfulness, it was only necessary to increase the liberty of every individual in society, trusting to the development of the good to overcome the evil. He believed in repression only when it is necessary to prevent oppression, and in force only when one man attempts by combining with others, or by his own superior craft or force, to deprive another of his equal right to exist, to do, and to grow. All this was a deduction from the principles of the common law as it had grown out of the race or clan customs of the Teutonic tribes — including in that classification, of course, the Saxons, who over-ran England, and the Norsemen, whose literature in Iceland is a prophecy of the institutions which were inaugurated in America by the Declaration of Independence.

In Jefferson's own generation and since, Benjamin Franklin is the only American who can compare with him in greatness of intellect. At the present stage of development of the science of history, it is no more possible to understand how the eighteenth century should have produced two such men in America than it is to explain how the sixteenth produced Shakespeare and Bacon in England. Both Franklin and Jefferson, while they had the ideas of Anglo-Saxon development ingrained into them, were deeply influenced by the intellectual movement of France. Under it, Franklin became a great philosopher, using with equal effectiveness the methods of Bacon and of Aristotle. As a Baconian, Jefferson failed almost completely. His province was to deal with the minds of men rather than with the laws of nature. But it may be fairly said of him that in the mastery of political principle through logical analysis he surpassed Franklin as far as he was surpassed by Franklin in reaching truth through experiment and induction.

After being worsted in the formation of the body of the Federal Constitution, Jefferson's adherents rallied at once and, compelling the adoption of the first ten amendments, so forced issues that when Jefferson was inaugurated in 1801, the country was ready for his action in reversing the theories which triumphed against him in the constitutional convention. Instead of "a strong central government," controlled by the people and ignoring the States as much as possible, he stood for "Jeffersonian anarchy"—the theory that "the government is best which governs least," and for the independent development of the States, united only for common defense. The most notable fact of his administration as President is that after inaugurating his political system successfully he defeated it by the Louisiana Purchase which forced issues over slavery.

W. V. B.

"JEFFERSONIAN DEMOCRACY" DEFINED

(First Inaugural Address, Delivered March 4th, 1801)

Friends and Fellow-Citizens:—

CALLED upon to undertake the duties of the first executive office of our country, I avail myself of the presence of that portion of my fellow-citizens which is here assembled, to express my grateful thanks for the favor with which they have been pleased to look towards me, to declare a sincere consciousness that the task is above my talents, and that I approach it with those anxious and awful presentiments which the greatness

of the charge and the weakness of my powers so justly inspire. A rising nation spread over a wide and fruitful land, traversing all the seas with the rich productions of their industry, engaged in commerce with nations who feel power and forget right, advancing rapidly to destinies beyond the reach of mortal eye; when I contemplate these transcendent objects, and see the honor, the happiness, and the hopes of this beloved country committed to the issue and the auspices of this day, I shrink from the contemplation, and humble myself before the magnitude of the undertaking. Utterly, indeed, should I despair, did not the presence of many whom I here see remind me that in the other high authorities provided by our Constitution I shall find resources of wisdom, of virtue, and of zeal on which to rely under all difficulties. To you, then, gentlemen, who are charged with the sovereign functions of legislation, and to those associated with you, I look with encouragement for that guidance and support which may enable us to steer with safety the vessel in which we are all embarked, amidst the conflicting elements of a troubled world.

During the contest of opinion through which we have passed, the animation of discussions and of exertions has sometimes worn an aspect which might impose on strangers unused to think freely and to speak and to write what they think; but this being now decided by the voice of the nation, announced according to the rules of the Constitution, all will, of course, arrange themselves under the will of the law, and unite in common efforts for the common good. All, too, will bear in mind this sacred principle, that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will, to be rightful, must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal law must protect, and to violate would be oppression. Let us, then, fellow-citizens, unite with one heart and one mind; let us restore to social intercourse that harmony and affection without which liberty, and even life itself, are but dreary things. And let us reflect, that, having banished from our land that religious intolerance under which mankind so long bled and suffered, we have yet gained little, if we countenance a political intolerance as despotic, as wicked, and capable of as bitter and bloody persecutions. During the throes and convulsions of the ancient world, during the agonizing spasms of infuriated man, seeking through blood and slaughter his long-lost liberty, it was not wonderful that the agitation of the billows

should reach even this distant and peaceful shore; that this should be more felt and feared by some and less by others; and should divide opinions as to measures of safety; but every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all Republicans: we are all Federalists. If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union, or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated, where reason is left free to combat it. I know, indeed, that some honest men fear that a republican government cannot be strong; that this government is not strong enough. But would the honest patriot, in the full tide of successful experiment, abandon a government which has so far kept us free and firm, on the theoretic and visionary fear that this government, the world's best hope, may, by possibility, want energy to preserve itself? I trust not. I believe this, on the contrary, the strongest government on earth. I believe it the only one where every man, at the call of the law, would fly to the standard of the law, and would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern. Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question.

Let us then, with courage and confidence, pursue our own federal and republican principles; our attachment to union and representative government. Kindly separated by nature and a wide ocean from the exterminating havoc of one quarter of the globe; too high-minded to endure the degradations of the others; possessing a chosen country, with room enough for our descendants to the hundredth and thousandth generation; entertaining a due sense of our equal right to the use of our own faculties, to the acquisitions of our own industry, to honor and confidence from our fellow-citizens, resulting not from birth, but from our actions and their sense of them; enlightened by a benign religion, professed, indeed, and practiced in various forms, yet all of them inculcating honesty, truth, temperance, gratitude, and the love of man, acknowledging and adoring an overruling Providence, which, by all its dispensations, proves that it delights in the happiness of man here and his greater happiness hereafter; with all these blessings, what more is necessary to make us a happy and

a prosperous people? Still one thing more, fellow-citizens — a wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government; and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities.

About to enter, fellow-citizens, on the exercise of duties which comprehend everything dear and valuable to you, it is proper you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our government, and consequently those which ought to shape its administration. I will compress them within the narrowest compass they will bear, stating the general principle, but not all its limitations. Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none; the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns, and the surest bulwarks against anti-republican tendencies; the preservation of the General Government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet-anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; a jealous care of the right of election by the people; a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of revolution, where peaceable remedies are unprovided; absolute aquiescence in the decisions of the majority, the vital principle of republics, from which is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism; a well-disciplined militia, our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war, till regulars may relieve them; the supremacy of the civil over the military authority — economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened; the honest payment of our debts, and sacred preservation of the public faith; encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid; the diffusion of information and arraignment of all abuses at the bar of the public reason; freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and freedom of person, under the protection of the Habeas Corpus; and trial by juries impartially selected. These principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us, and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our sages and blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment; they should be the creed of our political

faith; the text of civic instruction; the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of error or of alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety.

I repair then, fellow-citizens, to the post you have assigned me. With experience enough in subordinate offices to have seen the difficulties of this, the greatest of all, I have learned to expect that it will rarely fall to the lot of imperfect man to retire from this station with the reputation and the favor which bring him into it. Without pretensions to that high confidence you reposed in our first and greatest revolutionary character, whose pre-eminent services had entitled him to the first place in his country's love, and destined for him the fairest page in the volume of faithful history, I ask so much confidence only as may give firmness and effect to the legal administration of your affairs. I shall often go wrong through defect of judgment. When right, I shall often be thought wrong by those whose positions will not command a view of the whole ground. I ask your indulgence for my own errors, which will never be intentional; and your support against the errors of others, who may condemn what they would not, if seen in all its parts. The approbation implied by your suffrage is a great consolation to me for the past; and my future solicitude will be to retain the good opinion of those who have bestowed it in advance, to conciliate that of others by doing them all the good in my power, and to be instrumental to the happiness and freedom of all.

Relying, then, on the patronage of your good-will, I advance with obedience to the work, ready to retire from it whenever you become sensible how much better choices it is in your power to make. And may that Infinite Power which rules the destinies of the universe lead our councils to what is best, and give them a favorable issue for your peace and prosperity.

SIR JOSEPH JEKYLL

(1663–1738)

IN THE celebrated case of Doctor Sacheverell, against whom Sir Joseph Jekyll spoke at the impeachment trial in 1710, the effort was not so much to punish the defendant as to convict a political principle as treasonable. Sacheverell stood for unquestioning submission to authority. After the expulsion of the Stuarts, the English royal family had come to represent the right of popular resistance to wrongful power. So in the Sacheverell case, we have the extraordinary spectacle of the government itself, prosecuting a clergyman for asserting that to disobey established authority is to disobey God.

Jekyll was born in 1663, and was distinguished for his speeches both at the bar and in the House of Commons. He was at different periods Keeper of the Rolls, and Chief Commissioner of the Great Seal. He died August 19th, 1738. Pope refers to him in the couplet:—

> «Jekyll or some odd old Whig
> Who never changed his principles or wig.»

RESISTANCE TO UNLAWFUL AUTHORITY

(Delivered Tuesday, February 28th, 1710, at the Trial of Henry Sacheverell, D. D., on an Impeachment before the House of Lords for High Crimes and Misdemeanors)

My Lords:—

YESTERDAY your lordships heard the articles against Dr. Sacheverell, his answer, and the Commons' replication read; and the charge being opened, your lordships likewise heard the Doctor's sermon preached at St. Paul's, and the dedication of his Derby sermon; so that the case is now fully before your lordships.

That part which is assigned to me and some other gentlemen is to maintain the first article of the Commons' charge. The method I shall take will be, firstly, to show the importance of this article; secondly, to clear up and vindicate the justice of the

revolution; and, thirdly, to state the evidence or proof of this article, which charges the Doctor with traducing and condemning the revolution.

My lords, I must premise that the Commons cannot but think it hard that in this assembly of the British nation they should now, after more than twenty years enjoyment of the benefits arising by the Revolution; they cannot but think it hard, I say, that in this place, and at this time, they should be forced to plead in vindication of the justice of that Revolution. But since we must give up our right to the laws and liberties of the kingdom, or (which is all one) be precarious in the enjoyment of them, and hold them only during pleasure; if this doctrine of unlimited nonresistance prevails, the Commons have been content to undertake this prosecution; and they who share in the legislature with your lordships have put themselves into the condition of suitors for justice against this offender, in whom your lordships will find the reverse of a true British subject; for such a one is dutiful and submissive to his prince and true to the liberty of his country, but in this criminal your lordships will find virulent faction, and slavish submission.

As to the importance of this article, your lordships were rightly told yesterday that the whole charge centres in this article. If the justice of the revolution be established, the Toleration will be rejoiced in by some and be acquiesced in by all; the resolutions of the two houses of Parliament will have a just regard shown to them; her Majesty's administration will be no longer defamed, nor will that unhappy distinction of parties be capable of being heightened amongst us. But if the justice of the revolution (which is our foundation) be questioned, everything that is built on it is in some degree shaken, and occasion is given for disputes and factions, never to be ended but by a total subversion of our Constitution.

My lords, as it is self-evident that the honor of her Majesty's Government stands upon the justice of the revolution, so doth the peace and tranquillity of it depend upon that also. The Commons may appeal to your lordships and the whole nation in this matter. From what quarter is it that all that opposition and obstruction to the administration of the late king and her present Majesty have come? Has it not been from those who have questioned the lawfulness of the resistance made use of in the revolution; whose pursuit after power is indefatigable, and to

obtain which they would make a willing sacrifice of the common liberty; whilst others who have a contrary principle, and are convinced of the justice of that proceeding, have acted a quite contrary part? Have they not contributed everything in their power to strengthen the Government in her present Majesty's hands, as well as the late king's; and that with a zeal and constancy through several changes, which nothing but a principle could inspire? How much is owing to this zeal in promoting the settlement of the Protestant Succession, and how little to the contrary principle, every one that remembers the state of things at the end of the late king's reign can tell. Upon the present question, therefore, my lords, depends our present happiness and future hopes. Hath not this principle of unlimited nonresistance been revived by the professed and undisguised friends of the Pretender? Hath it not been prosecuted with an unusual warmth since his attempt upon her Majesty's crown? Can the Pretender have any hopes, but from the keeping alive such notions? Or can the queen's title receive any advantage from them? Or can it be reasonable to preach this doctrine in the reign of the best of princes, which can be of no use to any but the worst?

In clearing up and vindicating the justice of the revolution, which was the second thing proposed, it is far from the intent of the Commons to state the limits and bounds of the subject's submission to the sovereign. That which the law hath been wisely silent in, the Commons desire to be silent in too; nor will they put any case of a justifiable resistance, but that of the revolution only; and they persuade themselves that the doing right to that resistance will be so far from promoting popular license or confusion, that it will have a contrary effect, and be a means of settling men's minds in the love of and veneration for the laws; to rescue and secure which was the only aim and intention of those concerned in that resistance.

To make out the justice of the revolution, it may be laid down that as the law is the only measure of the prince's authority and the people's subjection, so the law derives its being and efficacy from common consent; and to place it on any other foundation than common consent is to take away the obligation this notion of common consent puts both prince and people under to observe the laws. And upon this solid and rational foundation the lawyers in all ages have placed that obligation, as appears by all our law-books. But instead of this, of later

times, patriarchical and other fantastical schemes have been framed to rest the authority of the law upon; and so questions of divinity have been blended with questions of law, when it is plain that religion hath nothing to do to extend the authority of the prince or the submission of the subject, but only to secure the legal authority of the one and enforce the due submission of the other, from the consideration of higher rewards and heavier punishments. And if this distinction were attended to, it might serve to bury the useless labors (to say no worse of them) of several divines and others on these subjects in utter oblivion.

My lords, nothing is plainer than that the people have a right to the laws and the Constitution. This right the nation hath asserted and recovered out of the hands of those who had dispossessed them of it at several times. There are of this two famous instances in the knowledge of the present age; I mean that of the Restoration and that of the Revolution; in both these great events were the regal power and the rights of the people recovered. And it is hard to say in which the people have the greatest interest; for the Commons are sensible that there is not one legal power belonging to the crown but they have an interest in it; and I doubt not but they will always be as careful to support the rights of the crown as their own privileges.

My lords, that the Constitution was wholly lost before, and recovered by the Restoration, is known to all; and before the revolution, it is known how popery and absolute power had invaded the Constitution. The regal supremacy, of such absolute necessity to preserve the peace of the kingdom, was disclaimed, and the papal supremacy, by a solemn embassy to Rome, owned and acknowledged, and no footsteps left of the regal supremacy but that which was worse than naught, an illegal High Commission Court; and at that time the popular rights, in almost all the species of them, were invaded; that great privilege of the people, on which all others depend,—that of giving their consent to the making new, or repealing old laws, was invaded; and a Dispensing Power, such as rendered all our laws precarious, and at the will of the prince, was exercised. These, and a great many other acts of absolute power are mentioned in that act of Parliament called the Bill of Rights. It would be to misspend your lordships' time to mention all the instances there given; for, my lords, the whole tenor of the administration then in being was agreed by all to be a total departure from the Constitution; the

nation was at that time united in that opinion, all but the criminal part of it. And as the nation joined in the judgment of their disease, so they did in the remedy. They saw there was no remedy left but the last; and when that remedy took place, the whole frame of the Government was restored entire and unhurt. This showed the excellent temper the nation was in at that time, that after such provocations from an abuse of the regal power, and such a convulsion, no one part of the Constitution was altered, or suffered the least damage; but, on the contrary, the whole received new life and vigor.

My lords, as that doctrine of unlimited Nonresistance was implicitly renounced by the whole nation in the revolution, so divers acts of Parliament afterwards passed, expressing that renunciation. I beg leave to read a few passages out of the laws that were then made. In the 1st of King William and Queen Mary was the act for abrogating the oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance, and appointing other oaths. By that act, the Declaration enjoined to be taken by several acts, in the time of King Charles II., to this purpose, that it is not lawful, on any pretense whatsoever, to take up arms against the king, was taken away. Then in the second session of that Parliament was the act for declaring the rights and liberties of the subject; in that act notice is taken that the late King James did endeavor to subvert and extirpate the Protestant religion, and the laws and liberties of the kingdom; and the particular instances of maladministration are set forth: then it declares that that unhappy prince had abdicated the government, and the throne was thereby vacant; and that it had pleased Almighty God to make the Prince of Orange the glorious instrument of delivering the kingdom from popery and arbitrary power. And if the instrument who brought about that deliverance be styled glorious, surely the means used by him is (in consequence) approved and applauded; and his late Majesty is mentioned as the same glorious instrument in the act for paying the States-General the charges of his expedition. And surely this is an approbation of the means used by him, when that act charges the people with six hundred thousand pounds sterling for those means, namely, the force he brought along with him. But if it should be thought these words are too general, and do not particularly approve the resistance at the revolution, there came a memorable occasion when the Parliament had that particular under their consideration; and that was

when they were considering whether they should meddle with so tender a thing as the taking away the benefit of the law from a great many of the subjects of the kingdom,—which was done by an act in the same second session of that Parliament, entitled, «An act for preventing vexatious suits, against such as acted in order to the bringing in their majesties or for their service.» There they take notice that at the time of his Majesty's glorious enterprise for delivering this kingdom from popery and arbitrary power, and in aid and pursuance of the same, divers lords, gentlemen, and other good people well affected to their country, did act as lieutenants, deputy lieutenants, justices of the peace, or other officers, civil or military, though not sufficiently authorized thereunto; and did apprehend and put in custody several criminous and suspected persons; and did seize and use divers horses, arms, and other things; and did enter into the houses and possessions of several persons and did quarter, and cause to be quartered, soldiers and others there; which proceedings, in times of peace and common safety, would not have been warrantable; yet that act declares they were necessary, in regard of the exigence of public affairs, and ought to be justified; and provides an indemnity for those who acted in that resistance, from the actions that might be brought by their fellow-subjects.

My lords, I shall conclude this head with taking notice of the Form of Prayer, appointed by royal authority for the fifth of November, now doubly memorable; there is in that Form not only thanks offered to Almighty God for the revolution, but for the success given to those means that were used to bring about that wonderful deliverance; what else is the meaning of thanking God for giving his late Majesty a safe arrival here, and making all opposition fall before him, till he became our king and governor?

But, my lords, notwithstanding the justice of those steps that were taken to bring about the Revolution, notwithstanding the temper and prudence that was shown in the settlement of it, and the sanction since given to it, not only by the royal but the whole legislative authority, Doctor Sacheverell hath condemned the resistance (which was the principle, if not the only means) by which that deliverance was wrought; which was the last thing I proposed to show to your lordships.

My lords, this article is divided into three branches: first, the general charge that he suggests and maintains that the necessary

means used to bring about the revolution were odious and unjustifiable. The second and third branches are particulars of that general, namely, that his late Majesty disclaimed the least imputation of resistance, and that to impute resistance to the revolution is to cast black and odious colors upon his late Majesty and the said revolution.

To maintain this article, I will not repeat the particular words of the sermon in order to the application of them; that is a province which is assigned to another gentleman, who will speak after me; but I shall offer to your lordships what I apprehend to be the clear sense and meaning of those passages in the sermon, which maintain this article. In the eleventh page of the quarto edition, he lays down a general position of the utter illegality of resistance, upon any pretense whatsoever. He says, there are some who deny this position, who are new preachers and new politicians, who teach divers antimonarchical and pernicious doctrines. He goes on and says they do not only deny this position, but urge the revolution in defense of their denial; that is, by producing that as an instance of a justifiable resistance. Then he exclaims against these men, as endeavoring to cast black and odious colors on the late king and the revolution; whereas, he says the king disclaimed the least imputation of resistance by his declaration; and the Parliament disowned it, because they declare they only filled a vacant throne, without taking notice how it became so; and they burned a book which alleged conquest, because it had that ingredient of resistance in it.

This extract out of the sermon makes out the first article, which is his condemning the resistance, which the Commons call the necessary means used to bring about the revolution. For, firstly, that general position of his condemns resistance in any case whatsoever. Secondly, he introduces some as denying this position, and fastens a vile and odious character upon them. Thirdly, he makes those that deny this doctrine object to it an authority or precedent of a lawful resistance, namely, that at the revolution; but, my lords, this he does only to give up the lawfulness of that resistance, and condemn that as well as any other. For, fourthly, he answers this objection by denying there was any resistance in that case; a fact as clear as the sun at noonday, and which all the nation saw and rejoiced at. He brings the late king and the Parliament to witness against any resistance in the revolution; and yet he has shown by two

quotations out of the Prince of Orange's Declaration, one in his answer, and the other in the printed sermon, that his late Majesty was so far from disclaiming resistance, that he avowed it and invited the subjects of this kingdom to join in that resistance; for in his answer he cites that passage in his Declaration wherein his Majesty takes notice that he carried a force with him, sufficient, by the blessing of God, to defend him from the violence of evil counselors, and that he designed that expedition to oblige King James to call a free Parliament; and by his quotation of another passage in the Prince of Orange's Declaration, it appears his late Majesty was, by divers subjects of King James, invited to and assisted in that expedition; which being an expedition by force, to oblige that king to call a free Parliament, doth it not carry in it a plain and manifest avowing of resistance? My lords, as to what he says in relation to the Parliament's disowning any resistance at the revolution, by asserting that they set the crown on the king's head on no other title than that of the vacancy of the throne, that appears to be directly otherwise from the several passages in divers acts of Parliament which I have before mentioned; to which I only add that in the conference between the two houses, previous to the settling the crown on the king's head, the word "abdicated" was insisted upon and carried; for that it included in it the maladministration of King James, which the word "deserted" (desired to be used instead of it) did not, and this appears by the Journal. He, therefore, knowing that there was resistance at the revolution, and that the late king and the Parliament avowed that resistance, and he, pretending to defend it only by denying those facts, hath (by a necessary implication) asserted that that resistance was not an exception to his general rule, but stands condemned by it.

My lords, I shall not enter upon the consideration of the Doctor's answer to this article, because I do not know whether his counsel will think fit to abide by it; nor would I meddle with anything that is proper for the reply.

The sum of the whole proof is this: the Doctor lays down a doctrine condemning resistance in all cases whatsoever; he makes those who deny this doctrine asserters of antimonarchical principles; he takes notice of the revolution only to give it up; he admits that if there were resistance in that case, it was as unlawful as any other resistance. He asserts that to be true

which every one knows to be false; he says the late king disclaimed the least imputation of resistance; the Parliament disowned it; and they who say there was any resistance in it cast black and odious colors on the late king and the revolution; and consequently, he condemns the resistance used to bring about the revolution, which is the matter of the first article.

This, my lords, is what the Commons rely upon to maintain and make out the first article of their charge against the criminal at the bar; and they refer the consideration of it to your lordships' wisdom and justice.

ANDREW JOHNSON

(1808–1875)

THE speech delivered by President Johnson before the Southern Hotel in St. Louis on September 9th, 1866, is remarkable among the speeches of modern times as being the only one which ever formed the principal ground for impeaching a Chief Executive. The speech is the most characteristic of many similar ones delivered by the President during what was called at the time his "Swing around the Circle!" With another speech very much like it, delivered in Cleveland, it was offered in evidence against the President at his trial. As here reproduced from the official proceedings of the trial, with the "cheers," "groans," "hisses," and manifold other manifestations of the disturbed spirit of the crowd, it suggests, as nothing else could do, the conditions of unrest which succeeded the Civil War. Whatever bad qualities President Johnson may have had, whatever good qualities he may have lacked, he had the great strength of character which comes from unhesitating courage. At a time when he was still regarded by the Confederate element of his native State as one of their worst enemies, he had no hesitation in going before them to make speeches as open, as frank, as audacious as that with which he challenged the wrath of the majority of Congress. Had he been more self-controlled, he might have achieved the same mastery of circumstance which was instinctively exercised by Andrew Jackson. As it was, he modified history without making it. Attempting as a Union Democrat to carry out by combination with other Democrats a policy in which even Mr. Lincoln himself might have failed had he lived to attempt it, he succeeded only in so far as he forced the re-alignment of parties which made possible the liberal Republican movement and the policies of the Hayes administration, under which the Southern States regained their place in Congress, and in the electoral college. As a War Democrat, Johnson represented the views of the rights of the States and the powers of the Federal Government, which inspired Andrew Jackson's proclamation against Nullification and his second Inaugural Address. These views seemed patriotic enough in 1864 when Johnson was nominated for Vice-President as a means of winning the War Democrats to the support of President Lincoln's policies; but in 1866 when it appeared unmistakably that the country had a President who was as far from

sharing the views of Wendell Phillips as of Jefferson Davis, it was inevitable that issues should have been forced as they were. When we remember how great were the differences both of opinion and sympathy between the President and the majority of Congress; when we consider that the President was incapable of successful concealments and bold beyond the limits of rashness in denouncing those who displeased him; and when in retrospect we see issues joined thus radically and aggressively while the mental and moral condition of the country was still that of the worst civil war of modern times, it does not seem so remarkable that the President was impeached by the majority of Congress as that the country escaped a renewal of bloodshed. The vote of thirty-five to nineteen, by which the impeachment failed, was little short of the two-thirds majority necessary for conviction, but the Republican Senators whose vote prevented conviction represented the spirit of that element in their party which afterwards made possible the fulfillment of the general desire for more nearly complete reunion of the opposing sections. As he gave occasion for this element to exert its influence, it may be said that Johnson's failure as a President became finally a greater success than he could have planned or imagined as a statesman. It has often been denied that he was a great man; frequently he was far from being a wise one; but such as he was, he had the courage to make himself so effective, even through his worst crudities and most repellant blunders, that when history sums up the record made by American Presidents of the nineteenth century, this ex-tailor from the backwoods of Tennessee will be judged far from the least or the least useful among them.

W. V. B.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

(Delivered at the Kirkwood Hotel, Washington, April 15th, 1865, the Text Complete as Officially Reported)

Gentlemen: —

I MUST be permitted to say that I have been almost overwhelmed by the announcement of the sad event which has so recently occurred. I feel incompetent to perform duties so important and responsible as those which have been so unexpectedly thrown upon me. As to an indication of any policy which may be pursued by me in the administration of the Government, I have to say that that must be left for development, as the administration progresses. The message or declaration must be made by the acts as they transpire. The only assurance that I can give now of the future is by reference to the past. The course which

I have taken in the past in connection with this rebellion must be regarded as a guarantee for the future. My past public life, which has been long and laborious, has been founded, as I in good conscience believe, upon a great principle of right, which lies at the basis of all things. The best energies of my life have been spent in endeavoring to establish and perpetuate the blessings of free government; and I believe that the Government, in passing through its present trials, will settle down upon principles consonant with popular rights, more permanent and enduring than heretofore. I must be permitted to say, if I understand the feelings of my own heart, I have long labored to ameliorate and alleviate the condition of the great mass of the American people. Toil and an honest advocacy of the great principles of free government have been my lot. The duties have been mine — the consequences are God's. This has been the foundation of my political creed. I feel that in the end the Government will triumph, and that these great principles will be permanently established.

In conclusion, gentlemen, let me say that I want your encouragement and countenance. I shall ask and rely upon you and others in carrying the Government through its present perils. I feel, in making this request, that it will be heartily responded to by you and all other patriots and lovers of the rights and interests of a free people.

THE ST. LOUIS SPEECH FOR WHICH HE WAS IMPEACHED

(Delivered before the Southern Hotel in St. Louis, September 9th, 1866— Offered in Evidence by the Prosecution at His Trial as Reported Verbatim in the Missouri Democrat, September 10th, 1866)

Fellow-Citizens of St. Louis:—

IN BEING introduced to you to-night, it is not for the purpose of making a speech. It is true I am proud to meet so many of my fellow-citizens here on this occasion, and under the favorable circumstances that I do. [Cry: "How about British subjects?"] We will attend to John Bull after a while, so far as that is concerned. [Laughter and loud cheers.] I have just stated that I am not here for the purpose of making a speech, but, after being introduced, simply to tender my cordial thanks for the welcome you have given me in your midst. [A voice: "Ten thou-

sand welcomes!" hurrahs and cheers.] Thank you, sir; I wish it were in my power to address you under favorable circumstances upon some of the questions that agitate and distract the public mind at this time. Questions that have grown out of a fiery ordeal we have just passed through and which I think as important as those we have just passed by. The time has come when it seems to me that all ought to be prepared for peace—the rebellion being suppressed, and the shedding of blood being stopped, the sacrifice of life being suspended and stayed, it seems that the time has arrived when we should have peace; when the bleeding arteries should be tied up. [A voice: "New Orleans; go on!"]

Perhaps, if you had a word or two on the subject of New Orleans, you might understand more about it than you do. [Laughter and cheers.] And if you will go back [Cries for Seward]—if you will go back and ascertain the cause of the riot at New Orleans, perhaps you would not be so prompt in calling out New Orleans. If you will take up the riot at New Orleans, and trace it back to its source, or to its immediate cause, you will find out who was responsible for the blood that was shed there.

If you will take up the riot at New Orleans, and trace it back to the Radical Congress [Great cheering, and cries of "Bully!"], you will find that the riot at New Orleans was substantially planned—if you will take up the proceedings in their caucuses, you will understand that they there knew [Cheers] that a convention was to be called which was extinct, by its powers having expired; that it was said, and the intention was that a new government was to be organized; and in the organization of that government the intention was to enfranchise one portion of the population called the colored population, who had just been emancipated, and at the same time disfranchise white men. [Great cheering.] When you begin to talk about New Orleans, [Confusion] you ought to understand what you are talking about.

When you read the speeches that were made or take up the facts,—on Friday and Saturday before that convention sat,—you will there find that speeches were made incendiary in their character, exciting that portion of the population, the black population, to arm themselves and prepare for the shedding of blood. [A voice: "That's so!" and cheers.] You will also find that that convention did assemble in violation of law, and the intent of that convention was to supersede the recognized authorities in

the State government of Louisiana, which had been recognized by the Government of the United States, and every man engaged in that rebellion — in that convention, with the intention of superseding and upturning the civil government which had been recognized by the Government of the United States — I say that he was a traitor to the Constitution of the United States [Cheers], and hence you find that another rebellion was commenced, having its origin in the Radical Congress. These men were to go there; a government was to be organized, and the one in existence in Louisiana was to be superseded, set aside, and overthrown. You talk to me about New Orleans! And then the question was to come up, when they had established their government, — a question of political power, — which of the two governments was to be recognized — a new government inaugurated under this defunct convention — set up in violation of law and without the consent of the people. And then when they had established their government, and extended universal or impartial franchise, as they called it, to this colored population, then this Radical Congress was to determine that a government established on negro votes was to be the government of Louisiana. [Voices: "Never," and cheers and "Hurrah for Andy!"]

So much for the New Orleans riot — and there was the cause and the origin of the blood that was shed, and every drop of blood that was shed is upon their skirts, and they are responsible for it. [Cheers.] I could trace this thing a little closer, but I will not do it here to-night. But when you talk about New Orleans, and talk about the causes and consequences that resulted from proceedings of that kind, perhaps, as I have been introduced here, and you have provoked questions of this kind, though it doesn't provoke me, I will tell you a few wholesome things that have been done by this Radical Congress. [Cheers.]

In connection with New Orleans and the extension of the elective franchise, I know that I have been traduced and abused. I know it has come in advance of me here, as it has elsewhere, that I have attempted to exercise an arbitrary power in resisting laws that were intended to be enforced on the Government. [Cheers, and cries of "Hear!"]

Yes, that I had exercised the veto power ["Bully for you!"], that I had abandoned the power that elected me, and that I was a t-r-ai-tor [Cheers] because I exercised the veto power in attempting to, and did arrest for a time, a bill that was called a

Freedmen's Bureau Bill. [Cheers.] Yes, that I was a t-r-ai-t-o-r! And I have been traduced, I have been slandered, I have been maligned, I have been called Judas,—Judas Iscariot, and all that. Now, my countrymen here to-night, it is very easy to indulge in epithets, it is very easy to call a man Judas, and cry out t-r-ai-tor, but when he is called upon to give arguments and facts, he is very often found wanting.

Judaas, Judas Iscariot, Judaas! There was a Judas once, one of the twelve Apostles. Oh, yes! and these twelve Apostles had a Christ. [A voice: "And a Moses, too!" Great laughter.] The twelve Apostles had a Christ, and he could not have had a Judas unless he had had twelve Apostles. If I have played the Judas, who has been my Christ that I have played the Judas with? Was it Thad. Stevens? Was it Wendell Phillips? Was it Charles Sumner? [Hisses and cheers.] Are these the men that set up and compare themselves with the Savior of men, and everybody that differs with them in opinion and tries to stay and arrest their diabolical and nefarious policy is to be denounced as a Judas? ["Hurrah for Andy!" and cheers.]

In the days when there were twelve Apostles, and when there was a Christ, while there were Judases, there were unbelievers, too. Y-a-s; while there were Judases there were unbelievers. [Voices: "Hear!" "Three groans for Fletcher."] Yes, oh yes! unbelievers in Christ: men who persecuted and slandered and brought him before Pontius Pilate and preferred charges and condemned and put him to death on the cross, to satisfy unbelievers. And this same persecuting, diabolical, and nefarious clan to-day would persecute and shed the blood of innocent men to carry out their purposes. [Cheers.] But let me tell you—let me give you a few words here to-night—and but a short time since I heard some one say in the crowd that we had a Moses. [Laughter and cheers.] Yes, there was a Moses. And I know sometimes it has been said that I would be the Moses of the colored man. ["Never!" and cheers.] Why, I have labored as much in the cause of emancipation as any other mortal man living. But while I have strived to emancipate the colored man I have felt and now feel that we have a great many white men that want emancipation. [Laughter and cheers.] There are a set amongst you that have got shackles on their limbs, and are as much under the heel and control of their masters as the colored man that was emancipated. [Cheers.]

I call upon you here to-night as freemen — as men who favor the emancipation of the white man as well as the colored ones. I have been in favor of emancipation, I have nothing to disguise about that — I have tried to do as much, and have done as much, and when they talk about Moses and the colored man being led into the Promised Land, where is the land that this clan proposes to lead them? [Cheers.] When we talk about taking them out from among the white population and sending them to other climes, what is it they propose? Why, it is to give us a Freedmen's Bureau. And after giving us a Freedmen's Bureau, what then? Why, here in the South it is not necessary for me to talk to you, where I have lived and you have lived, and understand the whole system, and how it operates; we know how the slaves have been worked heretofore. Their original owners bought the land and raised the negroes, or purchased them, as the case might be; paid all the expenses of carrying on the farm, and in the end, after producing tobacco, cotton, hemp, and flax, and all the various products of the South, bringing them into the market without any profit to them, while these owners put it all into their own pockets. This was their condition before the emancipation. This was their condition before we became their "Moses." [Cheers and laughter.]

Now what is the plan? I ask your attention. Come; as we have got to talking on this subject, give me your attention for a few minutes. I am addressing myself to your brains, and not to your prejudices; to your reason and not to your passions. And when reason and argument again resume their empire, this mist, this prejudice that has been incrusted upon the public mind, must give way and reason become triumphant. [Cheers.] Now, my countrymen, let me call your attention to a single fact, the Freedmen's Bureau. [Laughter and hisses.] Yes, slavery was an accursed institution till emancipation took place. It was an accursed institution while one set of men worked them and got the profits. But after emancipation took place, they gave us the Freedmen's Bureau. They gave us these agents to go into every county, every township, and into every school district throughout the United States, and especially the Southern States. They gave us commissioners. They gave us $12,000,000, and placed the power in the hands of the Executive, who was to work this machinery, with the army brought to its aid, and to sustain it. Then let us run it on the $12,000,000 as a beginning, and in the

end receive $50,000,000 or $60,000,000, as the case may be, and let us work the four million of slaves. In fine, the Freedmen's Bureau was a simple proposition to transfer four million of slaves in the United States from their original owners to a new set of taskmasters. [Voice: "Never," and cheers.] I have been laboring four years to emancipate them; and then I was opposed to seeing them transferred to a new set of taskmasters, to be worked with more rigor than they had been heretofore. [Cheers.] Yes, under this new system they would work the slaves, and call on the Government to bear all the expense, and if there were any profits left, why they would pocket them [Laughter and cheers], while you, the people, must pay the expense of running the machine out of your pockets, and they get the profits of it. So much for this question.

I simply intended to-night to tender you my sincere thanks; but as I go along, as we are talking about this Congress and these respected gentlemen, who contend that the President is wrong, because he vetoed the Freedmen's Bureau Bill, and all this; because he chose to exercise the veto power, he committed a high offense, and therefore ought to be impeached. [Voice: "Never!"] Y-a-s, y-a-s, they are ready to impeach him. [Voice: "Let them try it!"] And if they were satisfied they had the next Congress, by as decided a majority as this, upon some pretext or other,—violating the Constitution,—neglect of duty, or omitting to enforce some act of law, upon some pretext or other, they would vacate the executive department of the United States. [A voice: "Too bad they don't impeach him."] Wha-t? As we talk about this Congress, let me call the soldiers' attention to this immaculate Congress. Let me call your attention. Oh! this Congress, that could make war upon the Executive because he stands upon the Constitution and vindicates the rights of the people, exercising the veto power in their behalf—because he dared to do this, they can clamor, and talk about impeachment. And by way of elevating themselves and increasing confidence with the soldiers throughout the country, they talk about impeachment.

So far as the Fenians are concerned. Upon this subject of Fenians, let me ask you very plainly here to-night, to go back into my history of legislation, and even when Governor of a State—let me ask if there is a man here to-night, who, in the

dark days of Know-nothingism, stood and sacrificed more for their rights? [Voice: "Good!" and cheers.]

It has been my peculiar misfortune always to have fierce opposition, because I have always struck my blows direct, and fought with right and the Constitution on my side. [Cheers.] Yes, I will come back to the soldiers again in a moment. Yes, here was a neutrality law. I was sworn to support the Constitution and see that that law was faithfully executed.

And because it was executed, then they raised a clamor and tried to make an appeal to the foreigners; and especially the Fenians. And what did they do? They introduced a bill to tickle and play with the fancy, pretending to repeal the law, and at the same time making it worse, and then left the law just where it is. [Voice: "That's so!"] They knew that whenever a law was presented to me, proper in its provisions, ameliorating and softening the rigors of the present law, that it would meet my hearty approbation, but as they were pretty well broken down and losing public confidence, at the heels of the session they found they must do something. And, hence, what did they do? They pretended to do something for the soldiers. Who has done more for the soldiers than I have? Who has periled more in this struggle than I have? [Cheers.] But then, to make them their peculiar friends and favorites of the soldiers, they came forward with a proposition to do what? Why, we will give the soldier fifty dollars bounty — fifty dollars bounty — your attention to this — if he has served two years; and one hundred dollars if he has served three years.

Now, mark you, the colored man that served two years can get his one hundred dollars bounty. But the white man must serve three before he can get his. [Cheers.] But that is not the point. While they were tickling and attempting to please the soldiers, by giving them fifty dollars bounty for two years' service, they took it into their heads to vote somebody else a bounty [Laughter], and they voted themselves not fifty dollars for two years service; your attention — I want to make a lodgment in your minds of the facts, because I want to put the nail in, and having put it in, I want to clinch it on the other side. [Cheers.] The brave boy, the patriotic young man who followed his gallant officers, slept in the tented field, and periled his life, and shed his blood, and left his limbs behind him and came home

mangled and maimed, can get fifty dollars bounty, if he has served two years. But the Members of Congress, who never smelt gunpowder, can get four thousand dollars extra pay. [Loud cheering.]

This is a faint picture, my countrymen, of what has transpired. [A voice: "Stick to that question."] Fellow-citizens, you are all familiar with the work of restoration. You know since the Rebellion collapsed, since the armies were suppressed on the field, that everything that could be done has been done by the executive department of the Government for the restoration of the Government. Everything has been done with the exception of one thing, and that is the admission of Members from the eleven States that went into the Rebellion. And after having accepted the terms of the Government, having abolished slavery, having repudiated their debt, and sent loyal Representatives, everything has been done excepting the admission of Representatives which all the States are constitutionally entitled to. [Cheers.] When you turn and examine the Constitution of the United States, you will find that you cannot even amend that Constitution so as to deprive any State of its equal suffrage in the Senate. [A voice: "They have never been out."] It is said before me: "They have never been out." I say so too, and they cannot go out. [Cheers.] That being the fact, under the Constitution they are entitled to equal suffrage in the Senate of the United States, and no power has the right to deprive them of it without violating the Constitution. [Cheers.] And the same argument applies to the House of Representatives.

How, then, does the matter stand? It used to be one of the arguments that if the States withdrew their Representatives and Senators that that was secession — a peaceable breaking up of the Government. Now, the Radical power in this Government turn around and assume that the States are out of the Union, that they are not entitled to representation in Congress. [Cheers.] That is to say, they are dissolutionists, and their position now is to perpetuate a disruption of the Government; and that, too, while they are denying the States the right of representation, they impose taxation upon them, a principle upon which, in the Revolution, you resisted the power of Great Britain. We deny the right of taxation without representation. That is one of our great principles. Let the Government be restored. I have labored

for it. Now I deny this doctrine of Secession, come from what quarter it may, whether from the North or from the South. I am opposed to it. I am for the Union of the States. [Voices: "That's right," and cheers.] I am for thirty-six States remaining where they are, under the Constitution, as your fathers made it, and handed it down to you. And if it is altered or amended, let it be done in the mode and manner pointed by that instrument itself, and in no other. [Cheers.]

I am for the restoration of peace. Let me ask this people here to-night if we have not shed enough blood. Let me ask: Are you prepared to go into another civil war? Let me ask this people here to-night are they prepared to set man upon man, and, in the name of God, lift his hand against the throat of his fellow. [Voice: "Never!"] Are you prepared to see our fields laid waste again, our business and commerce suspended, and all trade stopped? Are you prepared to see this land again drenched in our brothers' blood? Heaven avert it, is my prayer. [Cheers.] I am one of those who believe that man does sin, and, having sinned, I believe he must repent. And, sometimes, having sinned and having repented makes him a better man than he was before. [Cheers.] I know it has been said that I have exercised the pardoning power. Y-a-s, I have. [Cheers and "What about Drake's constitution?"] Y-a-s, I have, and don't you think it is to prevail? I reckon I have pardoned more men, turned more men loose and set them at liberty that were imprisoned, I imagine, than any other living man on God's habitable globe. [Voice: "Bully for you!" and cheers.] Yes, I turned forty-seven thousand of our men who engaged in this struggle, with the arms they captured with them, and who were then in prison, I turned them loose. [Voice: "Bully for you, old fellow!" and laughter.]

Large numbers have applied for pardon, and I have granted them pardon. Yet there are some who condemn and hold me responsible for so doing wrong. Yes, there are some who stayed at home, who did not go into the field on the other side, that can talk about others being traitors and being treacherous. There are some who can talk about blood and vengeance and crime and everything to "make treason odious," and all that, who never smelt gunpowder on either side. [Cheers.] Yes, they can condemn others, and recommend hanging and torture, and all that.

If I have erred, I have erred on the side of mercy. Some of these croakers have dared to assume that they are better than was the Savior of men himself,—a kind of over-righteousness,—better than everybody else, and always wanting to do Deity's work, thinking he cannot do it as well as they can. [Laughter and cheers.] Yes, the Savior of men came on the earth and found the human race condemned and sentenced under the law, but when they repented and believed, he said: "Let them live." Instead of executing and putting the world to death, he went upon the cross, and there was painfully nailed by these unbelievers that I have spoken of here to-night, and there shed his blood that you and I might live. [Cheers.] Think of it! To execute and hang and put to death eight millions of people. [Voices: "Never!"] It is an absurdity; and such a thing is impracticable, even if it were right. But it is the violation of all law, human and divine. [Voice: "Hang Jeff. Davis!"] You call on Judge Chase to hang Jeff. Davis, will you? [Great cheering.] I am not the court, I am not the jury, nor the judge. [Voice: "Nor the Moses!"] Before the case comes to me, and all other cases, it would have to come on application as a case for pardon. That is the only way the case can get to me. Why don't Judge Chase —Judge Chase, the Chief-Justice of the United States, in whose district he is—why don't he try him? [Loud cheers.] But, perhaps, I could answer the question; as sometimes persons want to be facetious and indulge in repartee, I might ask you a question: Why don't you hang Thad. Stevens and Wendell Phillips? [Great cheering.] A traitor at one end of the line is as bad as a traitor at the other.

I know that there are some who have got their little pieces and sayings to repeat on public occasions, like parrots, that have been placed in their mouths by their superiors, who have not the courage and the manhood to come forward and tell them themselves, but have their understrappers to do their work for them. [Cheers.] I know there are some who talk about this universal elective franchise upon which they wanted to upturn the government of Louisiana and institute another; who contended that we must send men there to control, govern, and manage their slave population, because they are incompetent to do it themselves. And yet they turn round when they get there and say they are competent to go to Congress and manage the affairs of State. [Cheers.] Before you commence throwing your

stones, you ought to be sure you don't live in a glass house. Then, why all this clamor! Don't you see, my countrymen, it is a question of power; and being in power as they are, their object is to perpetuate their power? Hence, when you talk about turning any of them out of office, oh, they talk about "bread and butter." [Laughter.] Yes, these men are the most perfect and complete "bread-and-butter party" that has ever appeared in this Government. [Great cheering.] When you make an effort or struggle to take the nipple out of their mouths, how they clamor! They have stayed at home here five or six years, held the offices, grown fat, and enjoyed all the emoluments of position; and now, when you talk about turning one of them out, "Oh, it is proscription"; and hence they come forward and propose in Congress to do what? To pass laws to prevent the Executive from turning anybody out. [Voice: "Put 'em out!"] Hence, don't you see what the policy was to be? I believe in the good old doctrine advocated by Washington, Jefferson, and Madison, of rotation in office.

These people who have been enjoying these offices seem to have lost sight of this doctrine. I believe that when one set of men have enjoyed the emoluments of office long enough, they should let another portion of the people have a chance. [Cheers.] How are these men to be got out — [Voice: "Kick 'em out!" Cheers and laughter], unless your Executive can put them, unless you can reach them through the President? Congress says he shall not turn them out, and they are trying to pass laws to prevent it being done. Well, let me say to you if you will stand by me in this action [Cheers], if you will stand by me in trying to give the people a fair chance, soldiers and citizens, to participate in those offices, God being willing, I will "kick them out" just as fast as I can. [Great cheering.] Let me say to you, in concluding, what I have said, and I intended to say but little, but was provoked into this, rather than otherwise, I care not for the menaces, the taunts, and jeers, I care not for the threats; I do not intend to be bullied by my enemies nor overawed by my friends [Cheers], but, God willing, with your help, I will veto their measures whenever they come to me. [Cheers.] I place myself upon the ramparts of the Constitution, and when I see the enemy approaching, so long as I have eyes to see, or ears to hear, or a tongue to sound the alarm, so help me God, I will do it and call upon the people to be my judges. [Cheers.] I tell

you here to-night that the Constitution of the country is being encroached upon. I tell you here to-night that the citadel of liberty is being endangered. [A voice: "Go it, Andy!"]

I say to you, then, go to work; take the Constitution as your palladium of civil and religious liberty; take it as your chief ark of safety. Just let me ask you here to-night to cling to the Constitution in this great struggle for freedom, and for its preservation, as the shipwrecked mariner clings to the mast when the midnight tempest closes around him. [Cheers.] So far as my public life has been advanced, the people of Missouri, as well as of other States, know that my efforts have been devoted in that direction which would ameliorate and elevate the interests of the great mass of the people. [Voice: "That's so."] Why, where's the speech, where's the vote to be got of mine, but what has always had a tendency to elevate the great working classes of the people? [Cheers.] When they talk about tyranny and despotism, where's one act of Andrew Johnson that ever encroached upon the rights of a freeman in this land? But because I have stood as a faithful sentinel upon the watch tower of freedom to sound the alarm, hence all this traduction and detraction that has been heaped upon me. ["Bully for Andy Johnson!"]

I now, then, in conclusion, my countrymen, hand over to you the flag of your country with thirty-six stars upon it. I hand over to you your Constitution with the charge and responsibility of preserving it intact. I hand over to you to-night the Union of these States, the great magic circle which embraces them all. I hand them all over to you, the people, in whom I have always trusted in all great emergencies,—questions which are of such vital interest,—I hand them over to you as men who can rise above party, who can stand around the altar of a common country with their faces upturned to heaven, swearing by him that lives forever and ever that the altar and all shall sink in the dust, but that the Constitution and the Union shall be preserved. Let us stand by the Union of these States, let us fight enemies of the Government, come from what quarter they may. My stand has been taken. You understand what my position is, and, in parting with you now, I leave the Government in your hands, with the confidence I have always had that the people will ultimately redress all wrongs and set the Government right. Then, gentlemen, in conclusion, I thank you for the cordial welcome you have given me in this great city of the Northwest, whose destiny

no one can foretell. Now [Voice: "Three cheers for Johnson!"], then, in bidding you good-night, I leave all in your charge, and thank you for the cordial welcome you have given me in this spontaneous outpouring of the people of your city.

AT CLEVELAND IN 1866

(Peroration of the Speech Offered in Evidence at the Impeachment Trial—From the Report of the Cleveland Leader)

Let me say to you of the threats from your Stevenses, Sumners, Phillipses, and all that class, I care not for them. As they once talked about forming a "league with hell and a covenant with the devil," I tell you, my countrymen here to-night, though the power of hell, death, and Stevens with all his powers combined, there is no power that can control me save you the people and the God that spoke me into existence. In bidding you farewell here to-night, I would ask you, with all the pains Congress has taken to calumniate and malign me, what has Congress done? Has it done anything to restore the Union of the States? But, on the contrary, has it not done everything to prevent it?

And because I stand now as I did when the Rebellion commenced, I have been denounced as a traitor. My countrymen here to-night, who has suffered more than I? Who has run greater risk? Who has borne more than I? But Congress, factious, domineering, tyrannical—Congress has undertaken to poison the minds of the American people, and create a feeling against me in consequence of the manner in which I have distributed the public patronage.

While this gang—this common gang of cormorants and bloodsuckers—have been fattening upon the country for the past four or five years—men never going into the field, who growl at being removed from their fat offices, they are great patriots! Look at them all over your district! Everybody is a traitor that is against them. I think the time has come when those who stayed at home and enjoyed offices for the last four or five years—I think it would be no more than right for them to give way and let others participate in the benefits of office. Hence you can see why it is that I am traduced and assaulted. I stood up by these men who were in the field, and I stand by them now.

I have been drawn into this long speech, while I intended simply to make acknowledgments for the cordial welcome; but if I am insulted while civilities are going on, I will resent it in a proper manner, and in parting here to-night I have no anger nor revengeful feelings to gratify. All I want now — peace has come and war is over — is for all patriotic men to rally round the standard of their country and swear by their altars and their God that all shall sink together, but that this Union shall be supported. Then in parting with you to-night, I hang over you this flag; — not of twenty-five, but of thirty-six stars; — I hand over to you the Constitution of my country — though imprisoned, though breaches have been made upon it — with confidence, hoping you will repair the breaches; I hand it over to you, whom I have always trusted and relied on, and, so far, have never deserted — and I feel confident, while speaking here to-night, for heart responds to heart of man, that you agree to the same great doctrine.

Then farewell! The little ill feelings aroused here to-night, — for some men have felt a little ill, — let us not cherish them. Let me say, in this connection, there are many white people in this country that need emancipation. Let the work of emancipation go on. Let white men stand erect and free. [A voice: "What about New Orleans?"] You complain of the disfranchisement of the negroes in the Southern States, while you would not give them the right of suffrage in Ohio to-day. Let your negroes vote in Ohio before you talk about negroes voting. Take the beam out of your own eye before you see the mote in your neighbor's eye. You are very much disturbed about New Orleans — but you will not allow the negro to vote in Ohio.

This is all plain; we understand this all, and in parting with you to-night let me invoke the blessing of God upon you, expressing my sincere thanks for the cordial manner in which you have received me.

RUFUS KING

(1755–1827)

RUFUS KING, joint author with Alexander Hamilton of the 'Camillus Letters,' represented the Hamiltonian view of the Federal Constitution in the speeches he made in the Massachusetts Ratifying Convention of 1787–88. The ability with which he expressed the ideas of the Federalist party made him its candidate for the Vice-Presidency in 1804 and 1808. He was born in Scarborough, Maine, March 24th, 1755. Educated at Harvard College, he settled in Newburyport, Massachusetts, in 1780, to practice law, and in 1784 was elected to represent Massachusetts in Congress. He was a member, both of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 and of the Massachusetts Ratifying Convention. Removing to New York city in 1788, he was elected next year to the United States Senate from New York, and in 1796 was appointed by President Washington United States Minister to England, where he remained until 1803. After his return, he again served in the Senate from 1813 to 1825, dying in 1827.

FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BY THE PEOPLE

(Delivered in the Massachusetts Convention in January 1788, on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution)

Mr. President: —

IT IS painful for me to obtrude my sentiments on the convention so frequently. However, sir, I console myself with the idea that my motives are as good as those of more able gentlemen, who have remained silent. Sir, this (the Preamble) is a very important clause, and of the highest consequence to the future fortune of the people of America. It is not my intention to go into any elaborate discussion of the subject. I shall only offer those considerations which have influenced my mind in favor of the article, in the hope that it may tend to reconcile gentlemen to it. It shall not be with a view of exhibiting any particular knowledge of mine; for such is not my intention. Hitherto we have considered the construction of the General Government. We now come, sir, to the consideration of the powers

with which that Government shall be clothed. The introduction to this Constitution is in these words: "We, the people," etc. The language of the Confederation is: "We, the States," etc., the latter is a mere federal government of States. Those, therefore, that assemble under it have no power to make laws to apply to the individuals of the States confederated; and the attempts to make laws for collective societies necessarily leave a discretion to comply with them or not. In no instance has there been so frequent deviation from first principles as in the neglect or refusal to comply with the requisitions of general governments for the collection of moneys.

In the ancient governments, this has been the principal defect. In the United Provinces of the Netherlands, it has been conspicuously so. A celebrated political writer — I mean John DeWitt, formerly pensioner of Holland — said that, in the Confederacy of 1570, though the articles were declared equally binding on the several provinces, yet any one had it in its power to comply with the requisitions of the generality or not; and some provinces, taking advantage of this discretionary power, never paid anything. During forty years of war with Spain, the province of Holland paid fifty-eight parts of a hundred of all the expenses thereof. Two or three of the provinces never so much as passed a resolution to pay anything; and DeWitt says that two of them paid not a single guilder. What was the consequence? In one instance, Holland compelled a neighboring province to comply with the requisitions, by marching a force into it. This was a great instance of usurpation, made in the time of a war. The Prince of Orange and the generality found that they could not continue the war in this manner. What was to be done? They were obliged to resort to the expedient of doubling the ordinary requisitions on the States. Some of the provinces were prevailed upon to grant these requisitions fully, in order to induce Holland to do the same. She, seeing the other States appearing thus forward, not only granted the requisitions, but paid them. The others did not. Thus was a single province obliged to bear almost the whole burden of the war; and, one hundred years after, the accounts of this war were unsettled. What was the reason? Holland had but one voice in the States-General. That voice was feeble when opposed by the rest.

This fact is true. The history of our own country is a melancholy proof of similar truth. Massachusetts has paid while other States have been delinquent. How was the war carried on

with the paper money? Requisitions on the States for that money were made. Who paid them? Massachusetts and a few others. A requisition of twenty-nine million dollars was quotaed on Massachusetts, and it was paid. This State has paid in her proportion of the old money. How comes it, then, that gentlemen have any of this money by them? Because the other States have shamefully neglected to pay their quotas. Do you ask for redress? You are scoffed at. The next requisition was for eleven million dollars, six million dollars of which were to be paid in facilities, the rest in silver money, for discharging the interest of the national debt. If the legislatures found a difficulty in paying the hard money, why did they not pay the paper? But one million two hundred thousand dollars have been paid. And six States have not paid a farthing of it. . . .

Two States have not paid a single farthing from the moment they signed the Confederation to this day, if my documents are to be depended on, and they are open to the inspection of all. Now, sir, what faith is to be put in the requisitions on the States for moneys to pay our domestic creditors, and discharge our foreign debts, for moneys lent us in the day of difficulty and distress? Sir, experience proves, as well as anything can be proved, that no dependence can be placed on such requisitions. What method, then, can be devised to compel the delinquent States to pay their quotas? Sir, I know none. Laws, to be effective, therefore, must not be laid on States, but upon individuals. Sir, it has been objected to the proposed Constitution that the power is too great, and by this Constitution is to be sacred. But if the want of power is the defect in the old Confederation, there is a firmness and propriety in adopting what is here proposed, which gives the necessary power wanted. Congress now have power to call for what moneys, and in what proportion they please; but they have no authority to compel a compliance therewith. It is an objection in some gentlemen's minds that Congress should possess the power of the purse and the sword. But, sir, I would ask whether any government can exist or give security to the people which is not possessed of this power. The first revenue will be raised from the impost, to which there is no objection, the next from the excise; and if these are not sufficient, direct taxes must be laid. To conclude, sir, if we mean to support an efficient Federal Government, which, under the old Confederation, can never be the case, the proposed Constitution is, in my opinion, the only one that can be substituted.

CHARLES KINGSLEY

(1819–1875)

CHARLES KINGSLEY, celebrated in literature as the author of 'Hypatia,' 'Alton Locke,' and other widely-read novels, was even more celebrated during his lifetime for addresses and sermons which made him one of the great forces of English industrial reform. He attempted to compel the well-fed and well-satisfied commercial element of England to so much discontent with itself and with existing conditions as would render it merciful and helpful to the helpless. He was born at Holne, in Devonshire, June 12th, 1819. After graduating at Cambridge, he entered the ministry of the Established Church, and after a number of years of service in Hampshire he was made Canon of Middleham and afterwards of Chester and Westminster. At different periods of his life he was Professor of English in Queen's College in London, and of Modern History in Cambridge. He wrote a number of poems of great power, notably the 'Three Fishers,' one of the most remarkable lyrics of the century, embodying in a few stanzas of verse the same spirit which inspired his address on 'Human Soot.' He died January 23d, 1875.

HUMAN SOOT

(An Address Delivered at Liverpool in 1820, in Behalf of the Kirkdale Ragged Schools)

I AM here to plead for the Kirkdale Industrial Ragged School and Free-Schoolroom Church. The great majority of children who attend this school belong to the class of "street arabs," as they are now called; and either already belong to, or are likely to sink into, the dangerous classes—professional lawbreakers, profligates, and barbarians. How these children have been fed, civilized, Christianized, taught trades and domestic employments, and saved from ruin of body and soul, I leave to you to read in the report. Let us take hold of these little ones at once. They are now soft, plastic, moldable; a tone will stir their young souls to the very depths; a look will affect them forever. But a hardening process has commenced within them, and

if they are not seized at once they will become harder than adamant; and then scalding tears and the most earnest trials will be all but useless.

This report contains full and pleasant proof of the success of the schools; but it contains also full proof of a fact which is anything but pleasant — of the existence in Liverpool of a need for such an institution. How is it that when a ragged school like this is opened, it is filled at once; that it is enlarged year after year, and yet is filled and filled again? Whence comes this population of children who are needy, if not destitute; and who are, or are in a fair way to become, dangerous? And whence comes the population of parents whom these children represent? How is it that in Liverpool, if I am rightly informed, more than four hundred and fifty children were committed by the magistrates last year for various offenses — almost every one of whom, of course, represents several more, brothers, sisters, companions, corrupted by him, or corrupting him. You have your reformatories, your training ships, like your Akbar, which I visited with deep satisfaction yesterday — institutions which are an honor to the town of Liverpool, at least to many of its citizens. But how is it that they are ever needed? How is it — and this, if correct, or only half correct, is a fact altogether horrible — that there are now between ten and twelve thousand children in Liverpool who attend no school — twelve thousand children in ignorance of their duty to God and man, in training for that dangerous class, which you have, it seems, contrived to create in this once small and quiet port during a century of wonderful prosperity. And consider this, I beseech you — How is it that the experiment of giving these children a fair chance, when it is tried (as it has been in these schools), has succeeded? I do not wonder, of course, that it has succeeded, for I know who made these children, and who redeemed them, and who cares for them more than you or I, or their best friends, can care for them. But do you not see that the very fact of their having improved, when they had a fair chance, is proof positive that they had not had a fair chance before? How is that, my friends?

And this leads me to ask you plainly: What do you consider to be your duty toward those children; what is your duty toward those dangerous and degraded classes, from which too many of them spring? You all know the parable of the Good Samaritan. You all know how he found the poor wounded Jew by the way-

side; and for the mere sake of their common humanity, simply because he was a man, though he would have scornfully disclaimed the name of brother, bound up his wounds, set him on his own beast, led him to an inn and took care of him.

Is yours the duty which the good Samaritan felt?—the duty of mere humanity? How is it your duty to deal, then, with these poor little children? That, and I think a little more. Let me say boldly, I think these children have a deeper and nearer claim on you, and that you must not pride yourselves, here in Liverpool, on acting the good Samaritan, when you help a ragged school. We do not read that the good Samaritan was a merchant, on his march, at the head of his own caravan. We do not read that the wounded man was one of his own servants, or a child of one of his servants, who had been left behind, unable from weakness or weariness to keep pace with the rest, and had dropped by the wayside, till the vultures and the jackals should pick his bones. Neither do we read that he was a general, at the head of an advancing army, and that the poor sufferer was one of his own rank and file, crippled by wound or by disease, watching, as many a poor soldier does, his comrades march past to victory, while he is left alone to die. Still less do we hear that the sufferer was the child of some poor soldier's wife, or even of some drunken camp follower, who had lost her place on the baggage wagon, and trudged on with the child at her back, through dust and mire, till, in despair, she dropped her little one and left it to the mercies of the God who gave it her.

In either case, that good Samaritan would have known what his duty was. I trust that you will know, in like case, what your duty is. For is not this, and none other, your relation to these children in your streets, ragged, dirty, profligate, sinking and perishing, of whom our Lord has said: "It is not the will of your Father which is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish"? It is not his will. I am sure that it is not your will either. I believe that with all my heart. I do not blame you, nor the people of Liverpool, nor the people of any city on earth, in our present imperfect state of civilization, for the existence among them of brutal, ignorant, degraded, helpless people. It is no one's fault, just because it is every one's fault—the fault of the system. But it is not the will of God; and therefore the existence of such an evil is proof patent and sufficient that we

have not yet discovered the whole will of God about the matter; that we have not yet mastered the laws of true political economy which (like all other natural laws) are that will of God revealed in facts. Our processes are hasty, imperfect, barbaric — and their result is vast and rapid production; but also waste, refuse, is the shape of a dangerous class. We know well how, in some manufactures, a certain amount of waste is profitable — that it pays better to let certain substances run to refuse than to use every product of the manufacture; as in a steam mill, where it pays better not to consume the whole fuel, to let the soot escape, though every atom of soot is so much wasted fuel. So it is in our present social system. It pays better, capital is accumulated more rapidly, by wasting a certain amount of human life, human health, human intellect, human morals, by producing and throwing away a regular percentage of human soot — of that thinking, acting dirt, which lies about, and, alas! breeds and perpetuates itself in foul alleys and low public houses, and all dens and dark places of the earth.

But, as in the case of manufactures, the Nemesis comes swift and sure. As the foul vapors of the mine and the manufactory destroy vegetation and injure health, so does the Nemesis fall on the world of man; so does that human soot, these human poison gases, infect the whole society which has allowed them to fester under its feet.

Sad, but not hopeless! Dark, but not without a gleam of light on the horizon! For I can conceive a time when, by improved chemical science, every foul vapor which now escapes from the chimney of a manufactory, polluting the air, destroying the vegetation, shall be seized, utilized, converted into some profitable substance, till the black country shall be black no longer, the streams once more crystal clear, the trees once more luxuriant, and the desert which man has created in his haste and greed shall, in literal fact, once more blossom as the rose. And just so can I conceive a time when, by a higher civilization, formed on a political economy more truly scientific, because more truly according to the will of God, our human refuse shall be utilized, like our material refuse, when man as man, even down to the weakest and most ignorant, shall be found to be (as he really is) so valuable that it will be worth while to preserve his health, to develop his capabilities, to save him alive, body, intellect, and character, at any cost; because men will see that a

man is, after all, the most precious and useful thing on the earth, and that no cost spent on the development of human beings can possibly be thrown away.

I appeal, then, to you, the commercial men of Liverpool, if there are any such in this congregation. If not, I appeal to their wives and daughters who are kept in wealth, luxury, refinement, by the honorable labors of their husbands, fathers, brothers, on behalf of this human soot. Merchants are (and I believe that they deserve to be) the leaders of the great caravan which goes forth to replenish the earth and subdue it. They are among the generals of the great army which wages war against the brute powers of nature all over the world, to ward off poverty and starvation from the ever-teeming millions of mankind. Have they no time — I take for granted that they have the heart — to pick up the footsore and weary, who have fallen out of the march, that they may rejoin the caravan, and be of use once more? Have they no time — I am sure they have the heart — to tend the wounded and the fever-stricken, that they may rise and fight once more? If not, then must not the pace of their march be somewhat too rapid, the plan of their campaign somewhat too precipitate and ill directed, their ambulance train and their medical arrangements somewhat defective? We are all ready enough to complain of waste of human bodies brought about by such defects in the British army. Shall we pass over the waste, the hereditary waste of human souls, brought about by similar defects in every great city in the world?

Waste of human souls, human intellects, human characters — waste, saddest of all, of the image of God in little children! That cannot be necessary! There must be a fault somewhere. It cannot be the will of God that one little one should perish by commerce, or by manufacture, any more than by slavery, or by war.

As surely as I believe that there is a God, so surely do I believe that commerce is the ordinance of God; that the great army of producers and distributors is God's army. But for that very reason I must believe that the production of human refuse, the waste of human character, is not part of God's plan; not according to his ideal of what our social state should be; and therefore what our social state can be. For God asks no impossibilities of any human being.

But as things are, one has only to go into the streets of this, or any great city, to see how we, with all our boasted civiliza-

tion, are as yet but one step removed from barbarism. Is that a hard word? Why, there are the barbarians around us at every street corner! Grown barbarians — it may be now all but past saving — but bringing into the world young barbarians, whom we may yet save, for God wishes us to save them. It is not the will of their Father which is in heaven that one of them should perish. And for that very reason he has given them capabilities, powers, instincts, by virtue of which they need not perish. Do not deceive yourselves about the little dirty, offensive children in the street. If they be offensive to you, they are not to him that made them. "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven." Is there not in every one of them, as in you, the light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world? And know you not who that light is, and what he said of little children? Then take heed, I say, lest you despise one of these little ones. Listen not to the Pharisee when he says: Except the little child be converted, and become as I am, he shall in nowise enter into the kingdom of heaven. But listen to the voice of him who knew what was in man, when he said: "Except ye be converted, and become like little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." Their souls are like their bodies, not perfect, but beautiful enough and fresh enough to shame any one who shall dare to look down on them. Their souls are like their bodies, hidden by the rags, foul with the dirt of what we miscall civilization. But take them to the pure stream, strip off the ugly, shapeless rags, wash the young limbs again, and you shall find them, body and soul, fresh and lithe, graceful and capable — capable of how much, God alone who made them knows. Well said of such, the great Christian poet of your northern hills —

> "Not in entire forgetfulness,
> And not in utter nakedness,
> But trailing clouds of glory do we come
> From God, who is our home."

Truly, and too truly, alas! he goes on to say —

> "Shades of the prison-house begin to close
> Upon the growing boy."

Will you let the shades of that prison-house of mortality be peopled with little save obscene phantoms? Truly, and too truly he goes on —

> «The youth, who daily further from the east
> Must travel, still is Nature's priest,
> And by the vision splendid,
> Is on his way attended.»

Will you leave the youth to know nature only in the sense in which an ape or a swine knows it; and to conceive of no more splendid vision than that which he may behold at a penny theatre? Truly again, and too truly, he goes on —

> «At length the man perceives it die away,
> And fade into the light of common day.»

Yes, to weak mortal man the prosaic age of manhood must needs come, for good as well as for evil. But will you let that age be — to any of your fellow-citizens — not even an age of rational prose, but an age of brutal recklessness; while the light of common day, for him, has sunk into the darkness of a common sewer?

And all the while it was not the will of their Father in heaven that one of these little ones should perish. Is it your will, my friends; or is it not? If it be not, the means of saving them, or at least the great majority of them, is easier than you think. Circumstances drag downward from childhood, poor, weak, fallen, human nature. Circumstances must help it upward again once more. Do your best to surround the wild children of Liverpool with such circumstances as you put round your own children. Deal with them as you wish God to deal with your beloved. Remember that, as the wise man says, the human plant, like the vegetable, thrives best in light; and you will discover, by the irresistible logic of facts, by the success of your own endeavors, by seeing these young souls grow, and not wither, live, and not die — that it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish.

J. PROCTOR KNOTT

(1830–)

AT THE time the address, 'The Glories of Duluth,' which immortalized J. Proctor Knott, of Kentucky, was delivered in the House of Representatives, the country was fairly entering the period of astonishing development which followed the restoration of business confidence after the Civil War. The great fortunes made by dealing in supplies, Government securities, and gold, during the war and immediately after it, were being invested in productive enterprises, notably in railroads, which were then developed, especially in the West, as they had never been before. As an incident of this development through genuine investment, the speculative spirit ran riot until the general public finally lost ability to discriminate between the legitimate and the speculative enterprises which were everywhere being forced on attention with characteristic American energy, often amounting to recklessness both of method and result. Towns were planted in cornfields, vast cities were laid out in sand and sagebrush, and country inhabited only by wild animals and Indians was covered all over — on maps and prospectuses — with a network of railroads and telegraph lines. At the height of the excitement of this period, Mr. Knott made his speech on Duluth which so appealed to the sense of the ridiculous, always underlying American seriousness, that it was read and re-read from one end of the country to the other, and quoted and laughed over as no speech made in Congress ever had been before. It is in keeping with its humor that, although Duluth succeeded in surviving it, Mr. Knott's career on national politics did not. He remained in public life after it, it is true, but he had achieved hopelessly the reputation of a humorist, and, although he was a man of marked ability and earnestness, the country at large would never take him seriously afterwards.

He was born near Lebanon, Kentucky, August 29th, 1830. After beginning the practice of law, he spent twelve years (from 1851 to 1863) in Missouri and in 1859 was chosen Attorney-General of that State. Returning to Kentucky, he was elected to Congress in 1866. He served six terms in the House of Representatives, retiring in 1880. From 1883 to 1887, he served as Governor of Kentucky.

THE GLORIES OF DULUTH

(Delivered in the House of Representatives, January 27th, 1871, on the St. Croix and Bayfield Railroad Bill)

Mr. Speaker:—

If I could be actuated by any conceivable inducement to betray the sacred trust reposed in me by those to whose generous confidence I am indebted for the honor of a seat on this floor; if I could be influenced by any possible consideration to become instrumental in giving away, in violation of their known wishes, any portion of their interest in the public domain for the mere promotion of any railroad enterprise whatever, I should certainly feel a strong inclination to give this measure my most earnest and hearty support; for I am assured that its success would materially enhance the pecuniary prosperity of some of the most valued friends I have on earth — friends for whose accommodation I would be willing to make almost any sacrifice not involving my personal honor, or my fidelity as the trustee of an express trust. And that fact of itself would be sufficient to countervail almost any objection I might entertain to the passage of this bill, not inspired by an imperative and inexorable sense of public duty.

But, independent of the seductive influences of private friendship, to which I admit I am, perhaps, as susceptible as any of the gentlemen I see around me, the intrinsic merits of the measure itself are of such an extraordinary character as to commend it most strongly to the favorable consideration of every member of this House,— myself not excepted,— notwithstanding my constituents, in whose behalf alone I am acting here, would not be benefited by its passage one particle more than they would be by a project to cultivate an orange grove on the bleakest summit of Greenland's icy mountains.

Now, sir, as to those great trunk lines of railway, spanning the continent from ocean to ocean, I confess my mind has never been fully made up. It is true they may afford some trifling advantages to local traffic, and they may even in time become the channels of a more extended commerce. Yet I have never been thoroughly satisfied either of the necessity or expediency of projects promising such meagre results to the great body of our people. But with regard to the transcendent merits of the

gigantic enterprise contemplated in this bill, I never entertained the shadow of a doubt.

Years ago, when I first heard that there was somewhere in the vast *terra incognita*, somewhere in the bleak regions of the great Northwest, a stream of water known to the nomadic inhabitants of the neighborhood as the River St. Croix, I became satisfied that the construction of a railroad from that raging torrent to some point in the civilized world was essential to the happiness and prosperity of the American people, if not absolutely indispensable to the perpetuity of republican institutions on this continent. I felt instinctively that the boundless resources of that prolific region of sand and pine shrubbery would never be fully developed without a railroad constructed and equipped at the expense of the Government,—and perhaps not then. I had an abiding presentiment that some day or other the people of this whole country, irrespective of party affiliations, regardless of sectional prejudices, and "without distinction of race, color, or previous condition of servitude," would rise in their majesty and demand an outlet for the enormous agricultural productions of those vast and fertile pine barrens, drained in the rainy season by the surging waters of the turbid St. Croix.

These impressions, derived simply and solely from the "eternal fitness of things," were not only strengthened by the interesting and eloquent debate on this bill, to which I listened with so much pleasure the other day, but intensified, if possible, as I read over this morning the lively colloquy which took place on that occasion, as I find it reported in last Friday's Globe. I will ask the indulgence of the House while I read a few short passages, which are sufficient, in my judgment, to place the merits of the great enterprise contemplated in the measure now under discussion beyond all possible controversy.

The honorable gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Wilson], who, I believe, is managing this bill, in speaking of the character of the country through which this railroad is to pass, says this:—

> "We want to have the timber brought to us as cheaply as possible. Now, if you tie up the lands in this way so that no title can be obtained to them,—for no settler will go on these lands, for he cannot make a living,—you deprive us of the benefit of that timber."

Now, sir, I would not have it by any means inferred from this that the gentleman from Minnesota would insinuate that the

people out in his section desire this timber merely for the purpose of fencing up their farms so that their stock may not wander off and die of starvation among the bleak hills of the St. Croix. I read it for no such purpose, sir, and make no such comment on it myself. In corroboration of this statement of the gentleman from Minnesota, I find this testimony given by the honorable gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Washburn]. Speaking of these same lands he says:—

"Under the bill, as amended by my friend from Minnesota, nine-tenths of the land is open to actual settlers at $2.50 per acre; the remaining one-tenth is pine timbered land that is not fit for settlement, and never will be settled upon; but the timber will be cut off. I admit that it is the most valuable portion of the grant, for most of the grant is not valuable. It is quite valueless; and if you put in this amendment of the gentleman from Indiana, you may as well just kill the bill, for no man and no company will take the grant and build the road."

I simply pause here to ask some gentleman better versed in the science of mathematics than I am to tell me if the timbered lands are in fact the most valuable portion of that section of the country, and they would be entirely valueless without the timber that is on them, what the remainder of the land is worth which has no timber on it at all.

But further on I find a most entertaining and instructive interchange of views between the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Rogers], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Washburn], and the gentleman from Maine [Mr. Peters], upon the subject of pine lands generally, which I will tax the patience of the House to read:—

Mr. Rogers—Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. Washburn, of Wisconsin—Certainly.

Mr. Rogers—Are these pine lands entirely worthless except for timber?

Mr. Washburn, of Wisconsin—They are generally worthless for any other purpose. I am perfectly familiar with that subject. These lands are not valuable for purposes of settlement.

Mr. Farnsworth—They will be after the timber is taken off.

Mr. Washburn, of Wisconsin—No, sir.

Mr. Rogers—I want to know the character of these pine lands.

Mr. Washburn, of Wisconsin—They are generally sandy, barren lands. My friend from the Green Bay district [Mr. Sawyer] is him-

self perfectly familiar with this question, and he will bear me out in what I say, that these pine-timber lands are not adapted to settlement.

Mr. Rogers — The pine lands to which I am accustomed are generally very good. What I want to know is, what is the difference between our pine lands and your pine lands.

Mr. Washburn, of Wisconsin — The pine timber of Wisconsin generally grows upon barren, sandy land. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. Peters], who is familiar with pine lands, will, I have no doubt, say that pine timber grows generally upon the most barren lands.

Mr. Peters — As a general thing pine lands are not worth much for cultivation.

And further on I find this pregnant question, the joint production of the two gentlemen from Wisconsin: —

Mr. Paine — Does my friend from Indiana suppose that in any event settlers will occupy and cultivate these pine lands?

Mr. Washburn, of Wisconsin — Particularly without a railroad?

Yes, sir, "particularly without a railroad." It will be asked after awhile, I am afraid, if settlers will go anywhere unless the Government builds a railroad for them to go on.

I desire to call attention to only one more statement, which I think sufficient to settle the question. It is one made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Paine], who says: —

"These lands will be abandoned for the present. It may be that at some remote period there will spring up in that region a new kind of agriculture which will cause a demand for these particular lands; and they may then come into use and be valuable for agricultural purposes. But I know, and I cannot help thinking, that my friend from Indiana understands that for the present, and for many years to come, these pine lands can have no possible value other than that arising from the pine timber which stands on them."

Now, sir, who, after listening to this emphatic and unequivocal testimony of these intelligent, competent, and able-bodied witnesses, who that is not as incredulous as St. Thomas himself will doubt for a moment that the Goshen of America is to be found in the sandy valleys and upon the pine-clad hills of the St. Croix? Who will have the hardihood to rise in his seat on this floor and assert that, excepting the pine bushes, the entire region would not produce vegetation enough in ten years to fatten a grasshopper? Where is the patriot who is willing that

his country shall incur the peril of remaining another day without the amplest railroad connection with such an inexhaustible mine of agricultural wealth? Who will answer for the consequences of abandoning a great and warlike people, in possession of a country like that, to brood over the indifference and neglect of their Government? How long would it be before they would take to studying the Declaration of Independence and hatching out the damnable heresy of Secession? How long before the grim demon of civil discord would rear again his horrid head in our midst, "gnash loud his iron fangs and shake his crest of bristling bayonets"?

Then, sir, think of the long and painful process of reconstruction that must follow with its concomitant amendments to the Constitution: the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth articles. The sixteenth, it is of course understood, is to be appropriated to those blushing damsels who are, day after day, beseeching us to let them vote, hold office, drink cocktails, ride a-straddle, and do everything else the men do. But above all, sir, let me implore you to reflect for a single moment on the deplorable condition of our country in case of a foreign war, with all our ports blockaded, all our cities in a state of siege, the gaunt spectre of famine brooding like a hungry vulture over our starving land; our commissary stores all exhausted, and our famishing armies withering away in the field, a helpless prey to the insatiate demon of hunger; our navy rotting in the docks for want of provisions for our gallant seamen, and we without any railroad communication whatever with the prolific pine thickets of the St. Croix!

Ah, sir, I can very well understand why my amiable friends from Pennsylvania [Mr. Myers, Mr. Kelley, and Mr. O'Neill] should have been so earnest in their support of this bill the other day, and if their honorable colleague, my friend, Mr. Randall, will pardon the remark, I will say I considered his criticism of their action on that occasion as, not only unjust, but ungenerous. I knew they were looking forward with the far-reaching ken of enlightened statesmanship to the pitiable condition in which Philadelphia will be left unless speedily supplied with railroad connection in some way or other with this garden spot of the universe. And besides, sir, this discussion has relieved my mind of a mystery that has weighed upon it like an incubus for years. I could never understand before why there was so much excitement during the last Congress over the acquisition

of Alta Vela. I could never understand why it was that some of our ablest statesmen and most disinterested patriots should entertain such dark forebodings of the untold calamities that were to befall our beloved country unless we should take immediate possession of that desirable island. But I see now that they were laboring under the mistaken impression that the Government would need the guano to manure the public lands on the St. Croix.

Now, sir, I repeat I have been satisfied for years that if there was any portion of the inhabited globe absolutely in a suffering condition for want of a railroad, it was these teeming pine barrens of the St. Croix. At what particular point on that noble stream such a road should be commenced, I knew was immaterial, and so it seems to have been considered by the draughtsman of this bill. It might be up at the spring, or down at the foot log, or the water gate, or the fish-dam, or anywhere along the bank, no matter where. But in what direction it should run, or where it should terminate, were always to my mind questions of the most painful perplexity. I could conceive of no place on "God's green earth" in such straitened circumstances for railroad facilities as to be likely to desire or willing to accept such a connection. I knew that neither Bayfield nor Superior City would have it, for they both indignantly spurned the munificence of the Government when coupled with such ignominious conditions, and let this very same land grant die on their hands years and years ago rather than submit to the degradation of a direct communication by railroad with the piny woods of the St. Croix; and I knew that what the enterprising inhabitants of those giant young cities would refuse to take would have few charms for others, whatever their necessities or cupidity might be.

Hence, as I have said, sir, I was utterly at a loss to determine where the terminus of this great and indispensable road should be, until I accidentally overheard some gentleman the other day mention the name of "Duluth." Duluth! The word fell upon my ear with peculiar and indescribable charm, like the gentle murmur of a low fountain stealing forth in the midst of roses, or the soft, sweet accents of an angel's whisper in the bright, joyous dream of sleeping innocence. Duluth! 'Twas the name for which my soul had panted for years, as the hart panteth for the water-brooks. But where was Duluth? Never, in all my limited reading, had my vision been gladdened by seeing

the celestial word in print. And I felt a profounder humiliation in my ignorance that its dulcet syllables had never before ravished my delighted ear. I was certain the draftsmen of this bill had never heard of it, or it would have been designated as one of the termini of this road. I asked my friends about it, but they knew nothing of it. I rushed to the library and examined all the maps I could find. I discovered in one of them a delicate, hair-like line, diverging from the Mississippi near a place marked Prescott, which I suppose was intended to represent the river St. Croix, but I could nowhere find Duluth.

Nevertheless, I was confident it existed somewhere, and that its discovery would constitute the crowning glory of the present century, if not of all modern times. I knew it was bound to exist in the very nature of things; that the symmetry and perfection of our planetary system would be incomplete without it; that the elements of material nature would long since have resolved themselves back into original chaos if there had been such a hiatus in creation as would have resulted from leaving out Duluth. In fact, sir, I was overwhelmed with the conviction that Duluth not only existed somewhere, but that, wherever it was, it was a great and glorious place. I was convinced that the greatest calamity that ever befell the benighted nations of the ancient world was in their having passed away without a knowledge of the actual existence of Duluth; that their fabled Atlantis, never seen save by the hallowed vision of inspired poesy, was, in fact, but another name for Duluth; that the golden orchard of the Hesperides was but a poetical synonym for the beer-gardens in the vicinity of Duluth. I was certain that Herodotus had died a miserable death, because in all his travels and with all his geographical research he had never heard of Duluth. I knew that if the immortal spirit of Homer could look down from another heaven than that created by his own celestial genius upon the long lines of pilgrims from every nation of the earth to the gushing fountain of poesy opened by the touch of his magic wand; — if he could be permitted to behold the vast assemblage of grand and glorious productions of the lyric art called into being by his own inspired strains, he would weep tears of bitter anguish that, instead of lavishing all the stores of his mighty genius upon the fall of Ilion, it had not been his more blessed lot to crystallize in deathless song the rising glories of Duluth. Yet, sir, had it not been for this map, kindly furnished me by the legislature of

Minnesota, I might have gone down to my obscure and humble grave in an agony of despair, because I could nowhere find Duluth. Had such been my melancholy fate, I have no doubt that with the last feeble pulsation of my breaking heart, with the last faint exhalation of my fleeting breath, I should have whispered: "Where is Duluth?"

But thanks to the beneficence of that band of ministering angels who have their bright abodes in the far-off capital of Minnesota, just as the agony of my anxiety was about to culminate in the frenzy of despair, this blessed map was placed in my hands; and as I unfolded it a resplendent scene of ineffable glory opened before me, such as I imagine burst upon the enraptured vision of the wandering peri through the opening of Paradise. There, there for the first time, my enchanted eye rested upon the ravishing word, "Duluth."

This map, sir, is intended, as it appears from its title, to illustrate the position of Duluth in the United States; but if gentlemen will examine it, I think they will concur with me in the opinion that it is far too modest in its pretensions. It not only illustrates the position of Duluth in the United States, but exhibits its relations with all created things. It even goes further than this. It lifts the shadowy veil of futurity and affords us a view of the golden prospects of Duluth far along the dim vista of ages yet to come.

If gentlemen will examine it, they will find Duluth, not only in the centre of the map, but represented in the centre of a series of concentric circles one hundred miles apart, and some of them as much as four thousand miles in diameter, embracing alike, in their tremendous sweep, the fragrant savannas of the sunlit South and the eternal solitudes of snow that mantle the ice-bound North. How these circles were produced is, perhaps, one of the most primordial mysteries that the most skillful paleologist will never be able to explain. But the fact is, sir, Duluth is pre-eminently a central place, for I am told by gentlemen who have been so reckless of their own personal safety as to venture away into those awful regions where Duluth is supposed to be, that it is so exactly in the centre of the visible universe that the sky comes down at precisely the same distance all around it.

I find by reference to this map that Duluth is situated somewhere near the western end of Lake Superior; but as there is no

dot or other mark indicating its exact location, I am unable to say whether it is actually confined to any particular spot, or whether "it is just lying around there loose." I really cannot tell whether it is one of those ethereal creations of intellectual frostwork, more intangible than the rose-tinted clouds of a summer sunset; one of those airy exhalations of the speculator's brain, which I am told are ever flitting in the form of towns and cities along those lines of railroad, built with Government subsidies, luring the unwary settler as the mirage of the desert lures the famishing traveler on, and ever on, until it fades away in the darkening horizon; or whether it is a real, *bona fide*, substantial city, all "staked off," with the lots marked with their owners' names, like that proud commercial metropolis recently discovered on the desirable shores of San Domingo. But, however that may be, I am satisfied Duluth is there, or thereabout, for I see it stated here on this map that it is exactly thirty-nine hundred and ninety miles from Liverpool, though I have no doubt, for the sake of convenience, it will be moved back ten miles, so as to make the distance an even four thousand.

Then, sir, there is the climate of Duluth, unquestionably the most salubrious and delightful to be found anywhere on the Lord's earth. Now, I have always been under the impression, as I presume other gentlemen have, that in the region around Lake Superior it was cold enough for at least nine months in the year to freeze the smokestack off a locomotive. But I see it represented on this map that Duluth is situated exactly halfway between the latitudes of Paris and Venice, so that gentlemen who have inhaled the exhilarating airs of the one, or basked in the golden sunlight of the other, may see at a glance that Duluth must be a place of untold delights, a terrestrial paradise, fanned by the balmy zephyrs of an eternal spring, clothed in the gorgeous sheen of ever-blooming flowers, and vocal with the silvery melody of nature's choicest songsters. In fact, sir, since I have seen this map, I have no doubt that Byron was vainly endeavoring to convey some faint conception of the delicious charms of Duluth when his poetic soul gushed forth in the rippling strains of that beautiful rhapsody: —

"Know ye the land of the cedar and vine,
Where the flowers ever blossom, the beams ever shine;
Where the light wings of zephyr, oppressed with perfume,
Wax faint o'er the gardens of Gul in her bloom;

Where the citron and olive are fairest of fruit,
And the voice of the nightingale never is mute;
Where the tints of the earth and the lines of the sky,
In color though varied, in beauty may vie?»

As to the commercial resources of Duluth, sir, they are simply illimitable and inexhaustible, as is shown by this map. I see it stated here that there is a vast scope of territory, embracing an area of over two million square miles, rich in every element of material wealth and commercial prosperity, all tributary to Duluth. Look at it, sir! [pointing to the map]. Here are inexhaustible mines of gold; immeasurable veins of silver; impenetrable depths of boundless forest; vast coal-measures; wide, extended plains of richest pasturage,—all, all embraced in this vast territory, which must, in the very nature of things, empty the untold treasures of its commerce into the lap of Duluth.

Look at it, sir! [pointing to the map]. Do not you see from these broad, brown lines drawn around this immense territory that the enterprising inhabitants of Duluth intend some day to inclose it all in one vast corral, so that its commerce will be bound to go there whether it would or not? And here, sir [still pointing to the map], I find within a convenient distance the Piegan Indians, which, of all the many accessories to the glory of Duluth, I consider by far the most inestimable. For, sir, I have been told that when the smallpox breaks out among the women and children of that famous tribe, as it sometimes does, they afford the finest subjects in the world for the strategical experiments of any enterprising military hero who desires to improve himself in the noble art of war, especially for any valiant lieutenant-general whose—

«Trenchant blade, Toledo trusty,
For want of fighting has gone rusty.
And eats into itself for lack
Of somebody to hew and hack.»

Sir, the great conflict now raging in the Old World has presented a phenomenon in military science unprecedented in the annals of mankind,—a phenomenon that has reversed all the traditions of the past as it has disappointed all the expectations of the present. A great and warlike people, renowned alike for their skill and valor, have been swept away before the triumphant advance of an inferior foe, like autumn stubble before a

hurricane of fire. For aught I know, the next flash of electric fire that shimmers along the ocean cable may tell us that Paris, with every fibre quivering with the agony of impotent despair, writhes beneath the conquering heel of her loathed invader. Ere another moon shall wax and wane, the brightest star in the galaxy of nations may fall from the zenith of her glory never to rise again. Ere the modest violets of early spring shall open their beauteous eyes, the genius of civilization may chant the wailing requiem of the proudest nationality the world has ever seen, as she scatters her withered and tear-moistened lilies o'er the bloody tomb of butchered France. But, sir, I wish to ask if you honestly and candidly believe that the Dutch would have ever overrun the French in that kind of style if General Sheridan had not gone over there and told King William and Von Moltke how he had managed to whip the Piegan Indians!

And here, sir, recurring to this map, I find in the immediate vicinity of the Piegans "vast herds of buffalo" and "immense fields of rich wheat lands."

[Here the hammer fell. Many cries: "Go on! Go on!"

The Speaker — Is there objection to the gentleman of Kentucky continuing his remarks? The Chair hears none, the gentleman will proceed.]

I was remarking, sir, upon these vast "wheat fields" represented on this map in the immediate neighborhood of the buffaloes and the Piegans, and was about to say that the idea of there being these immense wheat fields in the very heart of a wilderness, hundreds and hundreds of miles beyond the utmost verge of civilization, may appear to some gentlemen as rather incongruous, as rather too great a strain on the "blankets" of veracity. But to my mind there is no difficulty in the matter whatever. The phenomenon is very easily accounted for. It is evident, sir, that the Piegans sowed that wheat there and plowed it with buffalo bulls. Now, sir, this fortunate combination of buffaloes and Piegans, considering their relative positions to each other and to Duluth, as they are arranged on this map, satisfies me that Duluth is destined to be the beef market of the world.

Here, you will observe (pointing to the map) are the buffaloes, directly between the Piegans and Duluth; and here, right on the road to Duluth, are the Creeks. Now, sir, when the buffaloes are sufficiently fat from grazing on these immense wheat fields, you see it will be the easiest thing in the world for the

Piegans to drive them on down, stay all night with their friends, the Creeks, and go into Duluth in the morning. I think I see them now, sir, a vast herd of buffaloes, with their heads down, their eyes glaring, their nostrils dilated, their tongues out, and their tails curled over their backs, tearing along toward Duluth, with about a thousand Piegans on their grass-bellied ponies, yelling at their heels! On they come! And as they sweep past the Creeks they join in the chase, and away they all go, yelling, bellowing, ripping, and tearing along, amid clouds of dust, until the last buffalo is safely penned in the stock-yards of Duluth!

Sir, I might stand here for hours and hours, and expatiate with rapture upon the gorgeous prospects of Duluth, as depicted upon this map. But human life is too short and the time of this House far too valuable to allow me to linger longer upon the delightful theme. I think every gentleman on this floor is as well satisfied as I am that Duluth is destined to become the commercial metropolis of the universe, and that this road should be built at once. I am fully persuaded that no patriotic Representative of the American people, who has a proper appreciation of the associated glories of Duluth and the St. Croix, will hesitate a moment to say that every able-bodied female in the land between the ages of eighteen and forty-five who is in favor of "women's rights" should be drafted and set to work upon this great work without delay. Nevertheless, sir, it grieves my very soul to be compelled to say that I cannot vote for the grant of lands provided for in this bill.

Ah! sir, you can have no conception of the poignancy of my anguish that I am deprived of that blessed privilege! There are two insuperable obstacles in the way. In the first place, my constituents, for whom I am acting here, have no more interest in this road than they have in the great question of culinary taste now perhaps agitating the public mind of Dominica, as to whether the illustrious commissioners who recently left this capital for that free and enlightened republic would be better fricasseed, boiled, or roasted, and in the second place these lands, which I am asked to give away, alas, are not mine to bestow! My relation to them is simply that of trustee to an express trust. And shall I ever betray that trust? Never, sir! Rather perish Duluth! Perish the paragon of cities! Rather let the freezing cyclones of the bleak Northwest bury it forever beneath the eddying sands of the raging St. Croix!

JOHN KNOX

(1505–1572)

"IT IS evident," said John Knox, "that the sword of God is not committed to the hand of man to use as it pleases him, but only to punish vice and maintain virtue." The speaker who made such assertions as this in the sixteenth century did it at the risk of his life. It is an assertion of the divine right of the subject to pass judgment on the exercise of the divine right claimed by kings. Knox is generally called "the greatest Reformer of Scotland." He was a Revolutionist as well as a Reformer, and the result of his protests against arbitrary power appeared unmistakably in the judgment passed on Charles I. He was born at Haddington, not far from Edinburgh, in 1505. His family belonged to the common people, but he obtained at Glasgow University and elsewhere an education far above that of the average churchman of the day. As a preacher, Knox became so celebrated that in 1551, after his removal to England, he was made one of the six Royal Chaplains, and in that capacity assisted in the revision of the prayer book under Edward VI. Leaving England for the Continent during the reign of Queen Mary, he made the acquaintance of Calvin and spent much time at Geneva. In 1559 he returned to Scotland, where, until his death in 1572, he was engaged in one hazardous contest after another with what he considered the "powers of darkness." As a result of his influence, his 'Confession of Faith' was adopted by Scotland on August 17th, 1560, and the Presbyterian Church, as he organized it, became the established church of Scotland.

AGAINST TYRANTS

(Exordium of the Sermon of August 19th, 1565, Delivered in Edinburgh from Isaiah xxvi. 13–16)

AS THE skillful mariner, being master, having his ship tossed with a vehement tempest and contrary winds, is compelled oft to traverse, lest that, either by too much resisting to the violence of the waves, his vessel might be overwhelmed, or, by too much liberty granted, might be carried whither the

fury of the tempest would, so that his ship should be driven upon the shore, and make shipwreck, even so doth our prophet Isaiah in this text, which now you have heard read. For he, foreseeing the great desolation that was decreed in the council of the Eternal against Jerusalem and Judah, namely, that the whole people that bear the name of God should be dispersed; that the holy city should be destroyed; the temple wherein was the Ark of the Covenant, and where God had promised to give his own presence, should be burned with fire; and the king taken, his sons in his own presence murdered, his own eyes immediately after be put out; the nobility, some cruelly murdered, some shamefully led away captives; and finally the whole seed of Abraham razed, as it were, from the face of the earth — the prophet, I say, fearing these horrible calamities, doth, as it were, sometimes suffer himself, and the people committed to his charge, to be carried away with the violence of the tempest, without further resistance than by pouring forth his and their dolorous complaints before the majesty of God, as in the thirteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth verses of this present text we may read. At other times he valiantly resists the desperate tempest, and pronounces the fearful destruction of all such as trouble the Church of God; which he pronounces that God will multiply, even when it appears utterly to be exterminated. But because there is no final rest to the whole body till the head return to judgment, he exhorts the afflicted to patience, and promises a visitation whereby the wickedness of the wicked shall be disclosed, and finally recompensed in their own bosoms.

These are the chief points of which, by the grace of God, we intend more largely at this present to speak: —

First, the prophet saith, "O Lord our God, other lords besides thee have ruled us."

This, no doubt, is the beginning of the dolorous complaint, in which he complains of the unjust tyranny that the poor afflicted Israelites sustained during the time of their captivity. True it is that the prophet was gathered to his fathers in peace, before this came upon the people: for a hundred years after his decease the people were not led away captive; yet he, foreseeing the assurance of the calamity, did beforehand indite and dictate unto them the complaint, which afterward they should make. But at the first sight it appears that the complaint has but small weight; for what new thing was it that other lords than God in his own

person ruled them, seeing that such had been their government from the beginning? For who knows not that Moses, Aaron, and Joshua, the judges, Samuel, David, and other godly rulers, were men, and not God; and so other lords than God ruled them in their greatest prosperity?

For the better understanding of this complaint, and of the mind of the prophet, we must, first, observe from whence all authority flows; and second, to what end powers are appointed by God: which two points being discussed, we shall better understand what lords and what authority rule beside God, and who they are in whom God and his merciful presence rules.

The first is resolved to us by the words of the Apostle, saying: "There is no power but of God." David brings in the eternal God speaking to judges and rulers, saying: "I have said ye are gods, and sons of the Most High." And Solomon, in the person of God, affirmeth the same, saying: "By me kings reign, and princes discern the things that are just." From which place it is evident that it is neither birth, influence of stars, election of people, force of arms, nor, finally, whatsoever can be comprehended under the power of nature, that makes the distinction betwixt the superior power and the inferior, or that establishes the royal throne of kings; but it is the only and perfect ordinance of God, who willeth his terror, power, and majesty, partly to shine in the thrones of kings, and in the faces of judges, and that for the profit and comfort of man. So that whosoever would study to deface the order of government that God has established, and allowed by his holy word, and bring in such a confusion that no difference should be betwixt the upper powers and the subjects, does nothing but avert and turn upside down the very throne of God, which he wills to be fixed here upon earth; as in the end and cause of this ordinance more plainly shall appear: which is the second point we have to observe, for the better understanding of the prophet's words and mind.

The end and cause, then, why God imprints in the weak and feeble flesh of man this image of his own power and majesty, is not to puff up flesh in opinion of itself; neither yet that the heart of him that is exalted above others should be lifted up by presumption and pride, and so despise others; but that he should consider he is appointed lieutenant to One, whose eyes continually watch upon him, to see and examine how he behaves himself in his office. St. Paul, in few words, declares the end

wherefore the sword is committed to the powers, saying: "It is to the punishment of the wicked doers, and unto the praise of such as do well."

Of which words it is evident that the sword of God is not committed to the hand of man to use as it pleases him, but only to punish vice and maintain virtue, that men may live in such society as is acceptable before God. And this is the true and only cause why God has appointed powers in this earth.

For such is the furious rage of man's corrupt nature that, unless severe punishment were appointed and put in execution upon malefactors, better it were that man should live among brutes and wild beasts than among men. But at this present I dare not enter into the descriptions of this common place; for so should I not satisfy the text, which by God's grace I purpose to explain. This only by the way — I would that such as are placed in authority should consider whether they reign and rule by God, so that God rules them; or if they rule without, besides, and against God, of whom our prophet here complains.

If any desire to take trial of this point, it is not hard; for Moses, in the election of judges, and of a king, describes not only what persons shall be chosen to that honor, but also gives to him that is elected and chosen the rule by which he shall try himself, whether God reign in him or not, saying: "When he shall sit upon the throne of his kingdom, he shall write to himself an exemplar of this law, in a book by the priests and Levites; it shall be with him, and he shall read therein, all the days of his life: that he may learn to fear the Lord his God, and to keep all the words of his law, and these statutes, that he may do them; that his heart be not lifted up above his brethren, and that he turn not from the commandment, to the right hand, or to the left."

The same is repeated to Joshua, in his inauguration to the government of the people, by God himself, saying: "Let not the book of this law depart from thy mouth, but meditate in it day and night, that thou mayest keep it, and do according to all that which is written in it. For then shall thy way be prosperous, and thou shalt do prudently."

The first thing, then, that God requires of him who is called to the honor of a king, is, the knowledge of his will revealed in his word.

The second is, an upright and willing mind, to put in execution such things as God commands in his law, without declining to the right, or to the left hand.

Kings, then, have not an absolute power to do in their government what pleases them, but their power is limited by God's word; so that if they strike where God has not commanded, they are but murderers; and if they spare where God has commanded to strike, they and their throne are criminal and guilty of the wickedness which abounds upon the face of the earth, for lack of punishment.

O that kings and princes would consider what account shall be craved of them, as well of their ignorance and misknowledge of God's will as for the neglecting of their office! But now to return to the words of the prophet. In the person of the whole people he complains unto God that the Babylonians (whom he calls "other lords besides God," both because of their ignorance of God and by reason of their cruelty and inhumanity) had long ruled over them in great rigor, without pity or compassion upon the ancient men and famous matrons; for they, being mortal enemies to the people of God, sought by all means to aggravate their yoke, yea, utterly to exterminate the memory of them, and of their religion, from the face of the earth. . . .

Hereof it is evident that their disobedience unto God and unto the voices of the prophets was the source of their destruction. Now have we to take heed how we should use the good laws of God; that is, his will revealed unto us in his word; and that order of justice which, by him, for the comfort of man, is established among men. There is no doubt but that obedience is the most acceptable sacrifice unto God, and that which above all things he requires; so that when he manifests himself by his word, men should follow according to their vocation and commandment. Now so it is that God, by that great pastor our Lord Jesus, now manifestly in his word calls us from all impiety, as well of body as of mind, to holiness of life, and to his spiritual service; and for this purpose he has erected the throne of his mercy among us, the true preaching of his word, together with the right administration of his sacraments; but what our obedience is, let every man examine his own conscience and consider what statutes and laws we would have to be given unto her.

Wouldst thou, O Scotland! have a king to reign over thee in justice, equity, and mercy? Subject thou thyself to the Lord

thy God, obey his commandments, and magnify thou the word that calleth unto thee, "This is the way, walk in it"; and if thou wilt not, flatter not thyself; the same justice remains this day in God to punish thee, Scotland, and thee Edinburgh especially, which before punished the land of Judah and the city of Jerusalem. Every realm or nation, saith the prophet Jeremiah, that likewise offendeth shall be likewise punished but if thou shalt see impiety placed in the seat of justice above thee, so that in the throne of God (as Solomon complains) reigns nothing but fraud and violence, accuse thine own ingratitude and rebellion against God; for that is the only cause why God takes away "the strong man and the man of war, the judge and the prophet, the prudent and the aged, the captain and the honorable, the counselor and the cunning artificer; and I will appoint, saith the Lord, children to be their princes, and babes shall rule over them. Children are extortioners of my people, and women have rule over them."

If these calamities, I say, apprehend us, so that we see nothing but the oppression of good men and of all godliness, and that wicked men without God reign above us, let us accuse and condemn ourselves, as the only cause of our own miseries. For if we had heard the voice of the Lord our God, and given upright obedience unto the same, God would have multiplied our peace, and would have rewarded our obedience before the eyes of the world. But now let us hear what the prophet saith further: "The dead shall not live," saith he, "neither shall the tyrants, nor the dead arise, because thou hast visited and scattered them, and destroyed all their memory."

From this fourteenth verse unto the end of the nineteenth, it appears that the prophet observes no order; yea, that he speaks things directly repugning one to another; for, first, he saith: "The dead shall not live"; afterward he affirms: "Thy dead men shall live." Secondly, he saith: "Thou hast visited and scattered them, and destroyed all their memory." Immediately after, he saith, "Thou hast increased thy nation, O Lord, thou hast increased thy nation. They have visited thee, and have poured forth a prayer before thee."

Who, I say, would not think that these are things not only spoken without good order and purpose, but also manifestly repugning one to another? For to live, and not to live, to be so destroyed that no memorial remains, and to be so increased that the coasts of the earth shall be replenished, seems to impart

plain contradiction. For removing of this doubt, and for better understanding the prophet's mind, we must observe that the prophet had to do with divers sorts of men; he had to do with the conjured and manifest enemies of God's people, the Chaldeans or Babylonians; even so such as profess Christ Jesus have to do with the Turks and Saracens. He had to do with the seed of Abraham, whereof there were three sorts. The ten tribes were all degenerated from the true worshiping of God and corrupted with idolatry, as this day are our pestilent papists in all realms and nations; there rested only the tribe of Judah at Jerusalem, where the form of true religion was observed, the law taught, and the ordinances of God outwardly kept. But yet there were in that body, I mean in the body of the visible Church, a great number that were hypocrites, as this day yet are among us that profess the Lord Jesus, and have refused papistry; also not a few that were licentious livers; some that turned their backs to God, that is, had forsaken all true religion; and some that lived a most abominable life, as Ezekiel saith in his vision; and yet there were some godly, as a few wheat-corns oppressed and hid among the multitude of chaff: now, according to this diversity, the prophet keeps divers purposes, and yet in most perfect order.

And first, after the first part of the complaint of the afflicted, as we have heard, in vehemency of spirit he bursts forth against all the proud enemies of God's people, against all such as trouble them, and against all such as mock and forsake God, and saith: "The dead shall not live, the proud giants shall not rise; thou hast scattered them and destroyed their memorial." In which words he contends against the present temptation and dolorous state of God's people, and against the insolent pride of such as oppressed them; as if the prophet should say: O ye troublers of God's people! howsoever it appears to you in this your bloody rage that God regards not your cruelty, nor considers what violence you do to his poor afflicted, yet shall you be visited, yea, your carcasses shall fall and lie as stinking carrion upon the face of the earth, you shall fall without hope of life, or of a blessed resurrection; yea, howsoever you gather your substance and augment your families, you shall be so scattered that you shall leave no memorial of you to the posterities to come, but that which shall be execrable and odious.

LOUIS KOSSUTH

(1802–1894)

KOSSUTH'S visit to the United States in 1852 caused the greatest excitement throughout the country, involving, as it did, the hotly disputed question of how far the country was justified in "moral intervention" to support republics struggling to establish themselves against despotism. The same question involved when it was proposed to entertain Kossuth officially at Washington reappeared in our relations with Spain in 1896 and 1897. Kossuth's speech on Local Self-Government, made at the congressional banquet tendered him at Washington, illustrates his remarkable powers, both of intellect and expression. His speeches in America would have been sufficient to perpetuate his name as an orator had he made no others. He was born at Monok, Zemplin, Hungary, April 27th, 1802. In his thirtieth year he entered the Hungarian Diet, where he served six years. Imprisoned by the Austrian Government in 1837, and released in 1840, he became editor of the Pesth Journal in 1841, and in 1847 he was again elected Deputy to the Diet. In 1848, largely because of his efforts, Austria was obliged to grant an independent Hungarian ministry, and when the next year, as the result of Austrian bad faith, the Hungarians were driven to insurrection, he was their leader. After the triumph of Austria in 1849, he lived as an exile in Turkey until he began the international tour during which he visited America in an unsuccessful attempt to win outside help against Austria. After his return to Europe, he resided in London and Turin, dying at the latter place March 20th, 1894.

LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT

(Address at the Congressional Banquet in Washington, January 7th, 1852)

SIR, as once Cyneas, the Epirote, stood among the Senators of Rome, who, with an earnest word of self-conscious majesty, controlled the condition of the world and arrested mighty kings in their ambitious march, thus, full of admiration and of reverence, I stand before you, legislators of the new capitol — that glorious hall of your people's collective majesty. The capitol

of old yet stands, but the spirit has departed from it and come over to yours, purified by the air of liberty. The old stands a mournful monument of the fragility of human things — yours as a sanctuary of eternal rights. The old beamed with the red lustre of conquest, now darkened by oppression's gloomy night — yours beams with freedom's bright ray. The old absorbed the world by its own centralized glory — yours protects your own nation against absorption, even by itself. The old was awful with irrestricted power — yours is glorious with having restricted it. At the view of the old nations trembled — at the view of yours humanity hopes. To the old misfortune was only introduced with fettered hands to kneel at the triumphant conqueror's heels — to yours the triumph of introduction is granted to unfortunate exiles, invited to the honor of a seat, and where kings and Cæsars will never be hailed, for their powers, might, and wealth, there the persecuted chief of a downtrodden nation is welcomed as your great Republic's guest, precisely because he is persecuted, helpless, and poor. In the old, the terrible *væ victis* was the rule — in yours, protection to the oppressed, malediction to ambitious oppressors, and consolation to the vanquished in a just cause. And while out of the old a conquered world was ruled, you in yours provide for the common confederative interests of a territory larger than the conquered world of the old. There sat men boasting their will to be sovereign of the world — here sit men whose glory is to acknowledge the laws of nature and of nature's God, and to do what their sovereign, the people, wills.

Sir, there is history in these parallels. History of past ages, and history of future centuries may be often recorded in a few words. The small particulars to which the passions of living men cling with fervent zeal — as if the fragile figure of men could arrest the rotation of destiny's wheel; these particulars die away. It is the issue which makes history, and that issue is always logical. There is a necessity of consequences wherever the necessity of position exists. Principles are the Alpha; they must finish with Omega, and they will. Thus history may be told often in a few words. Before yet the heroic struggle of Greece first engaged your country's sympathy for the fate of freedom in Europe, then so far distant, and now so near, Chateaubriand happened to be in Athens, and he heard from a minaret raised upon the Propylæan ruins a Turkish priest in Arabic language announcing the lapse of hours to the Christians of Minerva's town. What immense

history in the small fact of a Turkish Imaum crying out: "Pray, man, the hour is running fast, and the judgment draws near." Sir, there is equally a history of future ages written in the honor bestowed by you to my humble self. The first governor of independent Hungary, driven from his native land by Russian violence, an exile on Turkish soil protected by a Mohammedan Sultan against the blood-thirst of Christian tyrants, cast back a prisoner to far Asia by diplomacy, rescued from his Asiatic prison by America, crossing the Atlantic, charged with the hopes of Europe's oppressed nations, pleading, a poor exile, before the people of this great Republic, his downtrodden country's wrongs, and its intimate connection with the fate of the European continent, and with the boldness of a just cause claiming the principles of the Christian religion to be raised to a law of nations; and to see, not only the boldness of the poor exile forgiven, but to see him consoled by the sympathy of millions, encouraged by individuals, meetings, cities, and states, supported by operative aid, and greeted by Congress and by the Government as the nation's guest, honored out of generosity with that honor which only one man before him received — and that man received then out of gratitude — with honors such as no potentate can ever receive, and this banquet here, and the toast which I have to thank you for — oh, indeed, sir, there is a history of future ages in all these facts.

Sir, though I have the noble pride of my principles, and though I have the inspiration of a just cause still I have also the conscience of my personal humility. Never will I forget what is due from me to the sovereign source of my public capacity. This I owe to my nation's dignity, and, therefore, respectfully thanking this highly distinguished assembly, in my country's name, I have the boldness to say that Hungary well deserves your sympathy — that Hungary has a claim to protection, because it has a claim to justice. But as to myself, permit me humbly to express that I am well aware not to have in all these honors any personal share. Now, I know that even that which might seem to be personal in your toast is only an acknowledgment of a historical fact; very instructively connected with a principle valuable and dear to every republican heart in the United States of America. Sir, you were pleased to mention in your toast that I am unconquered by misfortune and unseduced by ambition. Now, it is a providential fact that misfor-

tune has the privilege to ennoble man's mind and to strengthen man's character. There is a sort of natural instinct of human dignity in the heart of man, which steels his very nerves not to bend beneath the heavy blows of a great adversity. The palm tree grows best beneath a ponderous weight — even so the character of man. There is no merit in it — it is a law of psychology. The petty pangs of small daily cares have often bent the character of men, but great misfortunes seldom. There is less danger in this than in great good luck; and as to ambition, I, indeed, never was able to understand how anybody can more love ambition than liberty. But I am glad to state a historical fact as a principal demonstration of that influence which institutions exercise upon the character of nations. We Hungarians are very fond of the principle of municipal self-government; and we have a natural horror against the principle of centralization. That fond attachment to municipal self-government, without which there is no provincial freedom possible, is a fundamental feature of our national character. We brought it with us from far Asia, a thousand years ago, and we conserved it throughout the vicissitudes of ten centuries.

No nation has perhaps so much struggled and suffered from the civilized Christian world as ours. We do not complain of this lot. It may be heavy, but it is not inglorious. Where the cradle of our Savior stood, and where his divine doctrine was founded, there another faith now rules, and the whole of Europe's armed pilgrimage could not avert this fate from that sacred spot, nor stop the rushing waves of Islamism absorbing the Christian Empire of Constantine. We stopped those rushing waves. The breast of my nation proved a breakwater to them. We guarded Christendom, that Luthers or Calvins might reform it. It was a dangerous time, and the dangers of the time often placed the confidence of all my nation into one man's hand, and their confidence gave power into his hands to become ambitious. But there was not a single instance in history where a man honored by his people's confidence had deceived his people by becoming ambitious. The man out of whom Russian diplomacy succeeded in making the murderer of his nation's confidence — he never had it, but was rather regarded always with distrust. But he gained some victories when victories were the moment's chief necessity. At the head of an army, circumstances placed him in the capacity to ruin his country. But he never had the

people's confidence. So, even he is no contradiction to the historical truth that no Hungarian whom his nation honored with its confidence was ever seduced by ambition to become dangerous to his country's liberty. That is a remarkable fact, and yet it is not accidental. It is the logical consequence of the influence of institutions upon the national character. Our nation, through all its history, was educated in the school of municipal self-government, and in such a country, ambition, having no field, has also no place in man's character.

The truth of this doctrine becomes yet more illustrated by a quite contrary historical fact in France. Whatever have been the changes of government in that great country,—and many they have been, to be sure,—we have seen a Convention, a Directorate of Consuls, and one Consul, and an Emperor, and the restoration,—the fundamental tone of the Constitution of France was power always centralized, Omnipotence always vested somewhere; and remarkably, indeed, France has never yet raised the single man to the seat of power who has not sacrificed his country's freedom to his personal ambition. It is sorrowful, indeed; but it is natural. It is in the garden of centralization that the venomous plant of ambition thrives. I dare confidently affirm, that in your great country there exists not a single man through whose brains has ever passed the thought that he would wish to raise the seat of his ambition upon the ruins of your country's liberty. If he could, such a wish is impossible in the United States. Institutions react upon the character of nations. He who sows the wind will reap the storm. History is the revelation of Providence. The Almighty rules by eternal laws, not only the material but the moral world; and every law is a principle, and every principle is a law. Men, as well as nations, are endowed with free will to choose a principle, but that once chosen, the consequences must be abided. With self-government is freedom, and with freedom is justice and patriotism. With centralization is ambition, and with ambition dwells despotism. Happy your great country, sir, for being so warmly addicted to that great principle of self-government. Upon this foundation your fathers raised a home to freedom more glorious than the world has ever seen. Upon this foundation you have developed it to a living wonder of the world. Happy your great country, sir, that it was selected by the blessing of the Lord, to prove the glorious practicability of a federative Union of many sover-

eign States, all conserving their State rights and their self-government, and yet united in one. Every star beaming with its own lustre, but all together one constellation on mankind's canopy!

Upon this foundation your country has grown to a prodigious power in a surprisingly brief period. You have attracted power in that. Your fundamental principles have conquered more in seventy-five years than Rome by arms in centuries. Your principles will conquer the world. By the glorious example of your freedom, welfare, and security, mankind is about to become conscious of its aim. The lesson you give to humanity will not be lost, and the respect of the State rights in the Federal Government of America and in its several States, will become an instructive example for universal toleration, forbearance, and justice, to the future States and Republics of Europe. Upon this basis will be got rid of the mysterious question of language, and nationalities raised by the cunning despotisms in Europe to murder Liberty, and the smaller States will find security in the principles of federative union, while they will conserve their national freedom by the principles of sovereign self-government; and while larger States, abdicating the principles of centralization, will cease to be a blood-field to sanguinary usurpation, and a tool to the ambition of wicked men, municipal institutions will insure the development of local particular elements. Freedom, formerly an abstract political theory, will become the household benefit to municipalities, and out of the welfare and contentment of all parts will flow happiness, peace, and security for the whole. That is my confident hope. There will at once subside the fluctuations of Germany's fate. It will become the heart of Europe, not by melting North Germany into a Southern frame, or the South into a Northern; not by absorbing historical peculiarities, by centralized omnipotence; not by mixing in one State, but by federating several sovereign States into a Union like yours, upon a similar basis, will take place the national regeneration of the Slavonic States, and not upon the sacrilegious idea of Panslavism, equivalent to the omnipotence of the Czar.

Upon a similar basis will we see fair Italy independent and free. Not unity, but union, will and must become the watchword of national bodies, severed into desecrated limbs by provisional rivalries, out of which a flock of despots and common servitude arose. To be sure, it will be a noble joy to this your great

Republic to feel that the moral influence of your glorious example has operated in producing this glorious development in mankind's destiny; and I have not the slightest doubt of the efficacy of your example's influence. But there is one thing indispensable to it, without which there is no hope for this happy issue. This indispensable thing is, that the oppressed nations of Europe become the masters of their future, free to regulate their own domestic concerns, and to secure this nothing is wanted but to have that fair play to all, and for all, which you, sir, in your toast were pleased to pronounce as a right of my nation, alike sanctioned by the law of nations as by the dictates of eternal justice. Without this fair play there is no hope for Europe — no hope of seeing your principle spread. Yours is a happy country, gentlemen. You had more than fair play. You had active, operative aid from Europe in your struggle for independence, which, once achieved, you so wisely used as to become a prodigy of freedom and welfare, and a Book of Life to nations. But we, in Europe — we, unhappily, have no such fair play with us, against every palpitation of liberty. All despots are united in a common league, and you may be sure despots will never yield to the moral influence of your great example. They hate the very existence of this example. It is the sorrow of their thoughts and the incubus of their dreams. To stop its moral influence abroad, and to check its spreading development at home, is what they wish, instead of yielding to its influence. We will have no fair play. The Cossack already rules, by Louis Napoleon's usurpation, to the very borders of the Atlantic Ocean.

One of your great statesmen — now to my sorrow bound to the sick bed of advanced age — alas, that I am deprived of the advice which his wisdom could have imparted to me — your great statesman told the world thirty years ago that Paris was transferred to St. Petersburg. What would he now say, when St. Petersburg is transferred to Paris, and Europe is but an appendix to Russia? Alas! Europe can no longer secure to Europe fair play. Albion only remains. But even Albion casts a sorrowful glance over the waves. Still we will stand our place, sink or swim, live or die. You know the word. It is your own. We will follow it. It will be a bloody path to tread. Despots have conspired against the world. Terror spreads over Europe, and anticipating persecution rules from Paris to Pesth. There is a gloomy silence, like the silence of nature before the terrors of a

hurricane. It is a sensible silence, only disturbed by the thousandfold rattling of muskets by which Napoleon murders the people who gave him a home when he was an exile, and by the groans of new martyrs in Sicily, Milan, Vienna, and Pesth. The very sympathy which I met in England, and was expected to meet here, throws my sisters into the dungeons of Austria. Well, God's will be done. The heart may break, but duty will be done. We will stand in our place, though to us in Europe there be no fair play. But so much I hope, that no just man on earth can charge me with unbecoming arrogance, when here, on this soil of freedom, I kneel down and raise my prayer to God — "Almighty Father of Humanity, will thy merciful arm not raise a power on earth to protect the law of nations, when there are so many to violate it?" It is a prayer and nothing else. What would remain to the oppressed if they were not permitted to pray? The rest is in the hand of God.

Gentlemen, I know where I stand. No honor, no encouraging generosity, will make me ever forget where I stand and what is due from me to you. Here my duty is silently to await what you in your wisdom will be pleased to pronounce about that which public opinion knows to be my prayer and my aim, and be it your will to pronounce, or be it your will not to take notice of it, I will understand your will, and bow before it with devotion, love, and gratitude to your generous people, to your glorious land. But one single word, even here, I may be permitted to say, only such a word as may secure me from being misunderstood. I came to the noble-minded people of the United States to claim its generous operative sympathy for the impending struggle of oppressed freedom on the European Continent, and I freely interpreted the hopes and wishes which these oppressed nations entertain, but as to your great Republic, as a State, as a power on earth, I stand before the Statesmen, Senators, and Legislators of that Republic, only to ascertain from their wisdom and experience what is their judgment upon a question of national law and international right. I hoped, and now hope, that they will, by the foreboding events on the other great continent, feel induced to pronounce in time their vote about that law and those rights, and I hoped and hope that in pronouncing their vote, it will be in the broad principles of international justice, and consonant with their republican institutions and their democratic life.

That is all I know and Europe knows — the immense weight of such a pronunciation from such a place. But never had I the impious wish to try to entangle this great Republic into difficulties inconsistent with its own welfare, its own security, its own interest. I rather repeatedly and earnestly declared that a war on this account by your country is utterly impossible, and a mere phantom. I always declared that the United States remained masters of their actions, and under every circumstance will act as they judge consistent with the supreme duties to themselves. But I said and say that such a declaring of just principles would insure to the nations of Europe fair play in their struggle for freedom and independence, because the declaration of such a power as your Republic will be respected even where it is not liked; and Europe's oppressed nations will feel cheered in resolution, and doubled in strength, to maintain the decision of their American brethren on their own behalf with their own lives. There is an immense power in the idea to be right, when this idea is sanctioned by a nation like yours; and when the foreboding future will become present, there is an immense field for private benevolence, and sympathy upon the basis of the broad principles of international justice pronounced in the sanctuary of your people's collective majority. So much to guard me against misunderstanding.

Sir, I must fervently thank you for the acknowledgment that my country has proved worthy to be free. Yes, gentlemen, I feel proud of my nation's character, heroism, love of freedom and vitality, and I bow with reverential awe before the decree of Providence which placed my country in a position that, without its restoration to independence, there is no possibility for freedom and the independence of nations on the European continent. Even what now in France is about to pass proves the truth of this. Every disappointed hope with which Europe looked towards France is a degree more added to the importance of Hungary to the world. Upon our plains were fought the decisive battles for Christendom. There will be fought the decisive battle for the independence of nations, for State rights, for international law, and for democratic liberty. We will live free or die like men; but should my people be doomed to die, it will be the first whose death will not be recorded as a suicide, but as a martyrdom for the world; and future ages will mourn over the sad fate of the Magyar race, doomed to perish, not because in

the nineteenth century there was nobody to protect the laws of nature and of nature's God. But I look to the future with confidence and with hope. Adversities manifold of a tempest-tossed life, could not fail, of course, to impart a mark of cheerfulness upon my heart, which, if not a source of joy, is at least a guarantee against sanguine illusions. I, for myself, would not want the hope of success for doing what is right to me. The sense of duty would suffice. Therefore, when I hope, it has nothing in common with that desperate instinct of a drowning man, who, half sunk, is still grasping at a straw for help. No; when I hope, there is motive for the hope.

I have a steady faith in principles. I dare say that experience taught me the logic of events, in connection with principles. I have fathomed the entire bottom of this mystery, and was, I perceive, right in my calculations there, about once in my life. I supposed a principle to exist in a certain quarter, where, indeed, no principle proves to exist. It was a horrible mistake, and resulted in a horrible issue. The present condition of Europe is a very consequence of it; but precisely this condition of Europe proves I did not wantonly suppose a principle to exist there where I found none would have existed. The consequences could not have failed to arrive, as I have contemplated them well. There is a Providence in every fact. Without this mistake, the principles of American republicanism would, for a long time yet, find a sterile soil on that continent, where it was considered wisdom to belong to the French school. Now, matters stand thus: That either the continent of Europe has no future at all, or this future is American Republicanism. And who could believe that three hundred millions of that continent, which is the mother of civilization, are not to have any future at all? Such a doubt would be almost blasphemy against Providence. But there is a Providence, indeed — a just, a bountiful Providence — I trust, with the piety of my religion in it; I dare say my very humble self was a continual instrument of it. How could I be else in such a condition as I was — born not conspicuous by any prominent abilities? Having nothing in me more than an iron will which nothing can bend, and the consciousness of being right, how could I, under the most arduous circumstances, accomplish many a thing which my sense of honest duty prompted me to understand?

Oh, there is, indeed, a Providence which rules, even in my being here, when four months ago I was yet a prisoner of the league of European despots, in far Asia, and the sympathy which your glorious people honor me with, and the high benefit of the welcome of your Congress, and the honor to be your guest,—to be the guest of your great Republic,—I, the poor, humble, unpretending exile,—is there not a very intelligible manifestation of Providence in it?—the more when I remember that the name of your humble, but thankful guest, is, by the furious rage of the Austrian tyrant, to the gallows nailed. Your generosity is great, and loud your patriotism of republican principles against despotism. I firmly trust to those principles; and relying upon this very fact of your generosity, I may be permitted to say that that respectable organ of the free press may be mistaken, which announced that I considered my coming hither to be a failure. I confidently trust that the nations of Europe have a future. I am aware that the future is contradicted. Bayonets may support, but afford no chair to sit upon. I trust to the future of my native land, because I know that is worthy to have it; and it is necessary to the destinies of humanity. I trust to the principles of republicanism, whatever be my personal fate. So much I know, that my country will remember you and your glorious land with everlasting gratitude.

MAITRE FERNAND LABORI

(*c.* 1859–)

AT a great military trial in December 1894, Captain Alfred Dreyfus, of the French army, was convicted of selling military secrets to Germany, and was condemned to imprisonment for life on Devil's Island, off the coast of French Guiana. He is a Jew, and through the efforts of his wife, a heroic and devoted woman, much evidence was made public, tending to show that because of his Hebrew extraction he had been selected as a scapegoat for the real criminals. Madame Dreyfus was re-enforced in her work by powerful friends, and the matter was kept alive until, in the latter part of 1897, M. Scheurer-Kestner, vice-president of the French Senate, became convinced that Dreyfus had been the innocent victim of a conspiracy. When he announced this conclusion, it occasioned intense excitement. Dreyfus became at once the leading issue of French politics with the fate of the administration, if not of the Republic itself, depending on the result of the demand for a new hearing in his case. The army, "the anti-Semites," and the imperialists opposed revision, but when charges of forging the *bordereau*, on which Dreyfus was convicted, were made against Count Walsin-Esterhazy, his superiors in the war department were forced to court-martial him. He was promptly acquitted. Émile Zola, the celebrated French novelist, then published an address to President Faure, accusing prominent officials and army officers of conspiracy. The result was, as he expected, his arrest for libel. At the trial, which resulted in his conviction, he was defended by Maitre Fernand Labori, a young French advocate who entered the case as junior counsel, almost unknown, and left it one of the most celebrated lawyers of Europe. As Labori developed the evidence of the proceedings which led to the conviction of Dreyfus, the civilized world was astonished, and disgusted at what, if it had not been so repulsive, would have been a ludicrous melodrama of insane plotting. Generals and other high officers of the army, calling themselves chivalrous gentlemen, were exhibited in the act of habitually stooping over torn papers rescued from wastebaskets and receptacles for filth, piecing together scrap after scrap, with all the patient cunning of moral insanity and intellectual imbecility — in the hope of detecting someone else in a disgraceful act. This was called "patriotism." Justifying before the

public the result achieved through it was called «maintaining the honor of the army.» As the case developed after the conviction of Zola, fraud, perjury, forgery, suicide, and assassination were shown to be incidents of the methods of «military justice.» When the agitation forced the revision of the case, and in August 1899 Captain Dreyfus was brought back to France for the new trial which resulted in his conviction and pardon, Maitre Labori, who was engaged to defend him, was shot on his way to the court-room, in Rennes, August 14th, 1899, and severely wounded. In spite of the wound, however, he returned to the court-room after little more than a week's absence, and conducted the case to the end with masterly ability. As he made no speech at this trial, his review of the conspiracy, made in defending Zola, is here utilized. It was this speech which gave him his international reputation.

THE CONSPIRACY AGAINST DREYFUS

(From the Speech Delivered in Paris, February 23d, 1898, at the trial of Émile Zola. By Permission from «The Trial of Émile Zola.» Copyright 1898 by Benjamin R. Tucker, New York)

Reflect what the word of a minister of war must mean to military judges, whatever their good faith. The superior pledges his word, and they take it. But what an abyss of iniquity! If, again, such things were to occur amid the storms of war, it would be a different thing. What, then, matters one man's life, or a little more or less of justice? But these things took place in a state of peace when the country was perfectly secure. Or, again, if our army were an army of mercenaries, soldiers only, accepting the responsibilities of the military trade, which in that case is only a trade, perhaps then I would bow. But this is a matter of the national army; a matter that concerns all the young men of the nation, who are liable to have to appear before a military tribunal; a matter that concerns your sons, gentlemen. . . .

Your sons, innocent or guilty, are liable to be summoned before a military tribunal. You see that we introduce no venom into the debate. You see that the rights of the nation, the liberty of all, civilization itself is at stake; and if the country, when it shall know the truth and its full significance, does not revolt in indignation, I shall be unable to understand it.

That, gentlemen, is why it is necessary that those who understand and measure the gravity of this affair should take the floor; why it is necessary that all men of good-will, all true liberals, those who believe in the innocence of Dreyfus and those who do not, those who know and those who do not know, should unite in a sort of sacred phalanx to protest in the name of eternal morality; and that is what M. Zola has done.

In spite of closed doors, gentlemen, and by the great mass of Frenchmen who could not know at what price the verdict had been secured, Dreyfus might have been forgotten. But there was a little fireside in mourning where memory remained, and with memory hope. This fireside was that of the Dreyfus family, in regard to which so many calumnies have been spread; and, since this court refused to hear M. Lalance, let me read you what he has just said and published in the newspapers. I read from Le Journal des Débats:—

"The Dreyfus family consists of four brothers,—Jacques, Léon, Mathieu, and Alfred. They are closely united,—one soul in four bodies. In 1872 Alsatians were called upon to choose their nationality. Those who desired to remain Frenchmen had to make a declaration and leave the country. The three younger so chose, and left. The eldest, Jacques, who was past the age of military service, and who, moreover, had served during the war in the Legion of Alsace-Lorraine, did not so choose, and was declared a German. He sacrificed himself in order to be able, without fear of expulsion, to manage the important manufacturing establishment which constituted the family estate. But he promised himself that, if he had any sons, they should all be Frenchmen. The German law, in fact, permits a father to take out a permit of emigration for a son who has reached the age of seventeen. This son loses his German nationality, and cannot re-enter the country until he is forty-five years old. Jacques Dreyfus had six sons. In 1894 the two elder were preparing for the Polytechnic School and Saint Cyr. After the trial they had to go away; their career was broken. Two other brothers were in the Belfort School. They were driven out. What was the father to do, knowing that his young brother had been unjustly and illegally condemned? Was he to change his name, as other Dreyfuses have done? Should he abandon his projects, and resolve to have his sons serve in the German army for a year, that they might then re-enter the paternal house, and live in a city where the family was respected, and where everybody pitied and esteemed it? Had he done that, no one would have thrown a stone at him. In 1895 and 1896 his third

and fourth sons reached the age of seventeen. He said to them: 'My children, you are now to leave your father's house, never more to come back to it. Go to that country where your name is cursed and despised. It is your duty. Go.' And finally, in 1897, the father left his house, his business, and all his friends, and went to establish himself at Belfort, the city of which they wanted to make a fortress. He demanded French naturalization for himself and his two younger sons."

There you have a document to oppose to the floods of calumny and falsehood. In this family there were two members whose convictions could not be shaken, M. Mathieu Dreyfus and Mme. Dreyfus, whose fidelity is perhaps the most striking evidence of the innocence of her husband, for she, indeed, must know the truth. Mme. Dreyfus had lived beside this man; she knew his daily life; she saw his attitude throughout the trial; she knew the absence of proof; she knew what you yourselves know now, gentlemen. And she had seen the perseverance and firmness of her husband in ascending this Calvary; his courage at the moment of degradation; his attitude, always the same, even up to the present moment. . . . I think it is indispensable that you should hear this cry, always the same, as strong as ever, in spite of the prolongation of the torture. I read you a letter from the Iles du Salut, dated September 4th, 1897:—

Dear Lucie:—

I have just received the July mail. You tell me again that you are certain of complete light. This certainly is in my soul. It is inspired by the rights that every man has to ask it, when he wants but one thing,—the truth. As long as I shall have the strength to live in a situation as inhuman as it is undeserved, I shall write you to animate you with my indomitable will. Moreover, the late letters that I have written you are my moral testament, so to speak. In these I spoke to you first of our affection; I confessed also my physical and mental deterioration; but I pointed out to you no less energetically your duty. The grandeur of soul that we have all shown should make us neither weak nor vainglorious. On the contrary, it should ally itself to a determination to go on to the end, until all France shall know the truth and the whole truth. To be sure, sometimes the wound bleeds too freely, and the heart revolts. Sometimes, exhausted as I am, I sink under the heavy blows, and then I am but a poor human creature in agony and suffering. But my unconquered soul rises again, vibrating with grief, energy, and

implacable will, in view of that which to us is the most precious thing in the world, our honor and that of our children. And I straighten up once more to utter to all the thrilling appeal of a man who asks only justice in order to kindle in you all the ardent fire that animates my soul, and that will be extinguished only with my life.

I live only on my fever, proud when I have passed through a long day of twenty-four hours. As for you, you have not to consider what they say or what they think. It is for you to do your duty inflexibly, and to insist no less inflexibly on your right, the right of justice and truth. If in this horrible affair there are other interests than ours, which we have never failed to recognize, there are also the imprescriptible rights of justice and truth. There is the duty of all to put an end to a situation so atrocious, so undeserved. Then I can wish for us both and for all only that this frightful, horrible, and unmerited martyrdom may come to an end. . . .

Now I read to you what M. de Cassagnac wrote on September 14th, 1896:—

"Our *confrère*, Le Jour, pretends, not to prove the innocence of Dreyfus, but to show that his guilt is not demonstrated. This is already too much. Not that we reproach our *confrère* for pursuing such a demonstration, but that this demonstration is impossible. Like most of our fellow-citizens, we believe Dreyfus guilty, but, like our *confrère*, we are not sure of it. And, like our *confrère* also, we have the courage to say so, since we cannot be suspected of being favorable to the Jews, whom we combat here as persistently as we combat the Freemasons. The real question is: Can there be any doubt as to the guilt of Dreyfus? Now, thanks to the stupidity and the cowardice of the Government of the Republic, this question, far from being closed, remains perpetually open. Why? Because the Government did not dare to conduct the trial in the open, so that public opinion might be settled. . . .

Yes, traitors are abominable beings, who should be pitilessly shot like wild beasts; but, for the very reason that the punishment incurred is the more frightful and the more deserved, and carries with it no pity, it should not have been possible for the cowardice of the Government with reference to Germany to have left us in a horrible doubt which authorizes us to ask ourselves sometimes if really there is not on Devil's Island a human being undergoing in innocence a superhuman torture. Such doubt is a frightful thing, and it will continue, because publicity of trial furnishes the only basis for a revision. Now there is no revision. There is no appeal from a sentence wrapped in artificial and deliberate darkness."

That is what M. de Cassagnac said, and, when he wrote it, he did not know what you have learned during the last fortnight. You see, then, the source of the campaign to which Colonel Picquart alluded in one of his letters to General Gonse. It is not the article in L'Eclair, for those letters appeared before September 15th. It is these articles that I have just read you, the Dreyfusian campaign, there you have it. The article in L'Eclair, in which the name of Dreyfus was falsely written in full, was simply an infamy resorted to to stop that campaign.

. . . . . .

For a moment, gentlemen, it was the intention of the war department to let the light shine. But, when the interpellation was announced, it failed in courage. That is the truth. And so, when M. Castelin asked for information concerning the pretended escape of the traitor and the campaign that was beginning, General Billot ascended the tribune and pronounced for the first time these words, which were the beginning of the events which you are now witnessing: —

« Gentlemen, the question submitted to the chamber by the honorable M. Castelin is serious. It concerns the justice of the country and the security of the State. This sad affair two years ago was the subject of a verdict brought about by one of my predecessors in the war department. Justice was then done. The examination, the trial, and the verdict took place in conformity with the rules of military procedure. The council of war, regularly constituted, deliberated regularly, and in full knowledge of the cause, rendered a unanimous verdict. The council of revision unanimously rejected the appeal. The thing, then, is judged, and it is allowable for no one to question it. Since the conviction, all precautions have been taken to prevent any attempt at escape. But the higher reasons which in 1894 necessitated a closing of the doors have lost nothing of their gravity. So the Government appeals to the patriotism of the chamber for the avoidance of a discussion which may prevent many embarrassments, and, at any rate, for a closing of the discussion as soon as possible. »

Well, gentlemen, note this reply of General Billot. It is the heart of the question, and it is here that begins the fault, or, if you prefer, the error, of the Government. It is easy to accuse law-abiding citizens of inciting odious campaigns in their country; but, if we go back to the sources, it is easy to see where the responsibility lies, and here I have put my finger upon it. We are told confidently of the wrong done by the defenders of

the traitor in not demanding either a revision or a nullification of the verdict of 1894. Nullification? Why, it is the business of the minister of justice to demand that. Listen to Article 441 of the Code of Criminal Examination, applicable in military matters: —

"When, upon the exhibition of a formal order given to him by the minister of justice, the prosecuting attorney before the court of appeals shall denounce in the criminal branch of that court judicial acts, decrees, or verdicts contrary to the law, these acts, decrees, or verdicts may be annulled, and the police officials or the judge prosecuted, if there is occasion, in the manner provided in Chapter iii. of Title 4 of the present book."

Well, the secret document, gentlemen, was known in September 1896. The article in L'Eclair appeared September 15th; the Castelin interpellation was heard on November 16th; a petition from Mme. Dreyfus was laid before the chamber, and is still unanswered, as is also a letter from M. Demange to the president of the chamber on the same subject. Now, what was the Government's duty when this question first arose? Unquestionably to deny the secret document from the tribune, if it had not been communicated; and, if it had been, to declare that the procedure was in contempt of all law and should lead to the nullification of the verdict. That is what a free government would have done.

Now I wish to say a word of the difficulty of procuring the documents mentioned in the *bordereau*, upon which so much stress has been laid in order to exculpate Major Esterhazy. I will not dwell on the Madagascar note, which was of February 1894, and not of August, as has been said, and which consequently was not the important note of which General Gonse spoke. I wish to emphasize only one point, because it is the only one which, in the absence of the questions that I was not permitted to ask, has not been made perfectly clear by the confrontations of the witnesses, and which yet has a considerable significance. General de Pellieux spoke to you of the piece one hundred and twenty and its hydraulic check. I believe it is the first item mentioned in the *bordereau*. This check, said General Gonse, is important. I asked him at what date it figured in the military regulations, and at what date the official regulation had been known to the army. General Gonse answered that he was

unable to give information on that point. Well, gentlemen, the truth is this. The official regulations concerning siege pieces were put on sale at the house of Berger-Lebrault & Co., military booksellers, and they bear the date — do not smile, gentlemen, remembering that the *bordereau* was written in 1894,— they bear the date 1889. On page twenty-one you will find mention of the hydraulic check. "The purpose of the hydraulic check [it says] is to limit the recoil of the piece." In 1895 a new check was adopted for the piece one hundred and twenty, and this new check, as appears from the official regulations bearing date of 1895, is not known as a hydraulic check, but as the hydro-pneumatic check. Either the author of the *bordereau*, speculating on the innocence of foreigners, sent them in 1894 a note on the hydraulic check of the piece one hundred and twenty, which had been a public matter since 1889, and then really it is not worth while to say that Major Esterhazy could not have procured it; or else he sent them in 1894 a note on the hydro-pneumatic check, and then — there is no doubt about it — he could not have been an artilleryman.

You have been spoken to also concerning the *troupes de couverture*. Well, there are cards on sale in the most official manner, which appear annually, and which show in the clearest way the distribution of the troops of the entire French army for the current year. I do not know at all what the author of the *bordereau* sent, and General Gonse knows no better than I do. When he sends a document like the firing manual, he is very careful to say that it is a document difficult to procure, and he says it in a French that seems a little singular to one who remembers the French that Dreyfus writes in his letters. But, when he gives notes, he says nothing. So I infer that these notes are without interest and without importance.

Furthermore, the impossibilities were no less great for Dreyfus. For instance, it is impossible that a staff officer should speak of the firing manual in the way in which it is spoken of in the *bordereau*. They say the writer must have been an artilleryman. Well, that is not my opinion, for all the officers will tell you that there is not one of them who would refuse to lend his manual to an officer of infantry, especially if the request were made by a superior officer. General Mercier himself in an interview has declared that the documents have not the importance that is attributed to them; and it is true that they have

not, for a firing manual that is new in April or in August is no longer new in November or December. The foreign military *attachés* see these things at the grand manœuvres, and get all the information that they want. . . .

I desire to place myself, gentlemen, exclusively on the ground chosen by the minister of war, and on that ground we find that in 1894 the charge against Dreyfus being about to fall to the ground for want of proof, a man who was not a dictator, but simply an ephemeral cabinet minister in a democracy where the law alone is sovereign, dared to take it upon himself to judge one of his officers and hand him over to a court-martial, not for trial, but for a veritable execution. We find that, since then, nothing has been left undone in order to cover up this illegality. We find that men interested in deceiving themselves have heaped inexact declarations upon incomplete declarations. We find that all the power of the Government has been employed in enveloping the affair in darkness, even compelling the members of the council of war, whatever their loyalty, to give to the trial which they conducted the appearance of a judicial farce.

Well, all this, gentlemen, was bound to fill sincere men with indignation, and the letter of M. Émile Zola was nothing but the cry of the public conscience. He has rallied around him the grandest and most illustrious men in France. Do not be embarrassed, gentlemen, by the sophism with which they try to blind you, in telling you that the honor of the army is at stake. It is not at stake. It does not follow that the entire army is involved, because some have shown too much zeal and haste, and others too much credulity; because there has been a serious forgetfulness of right on the part of one, or of several. What is really of interest to the French army, gentlemen, is that it should not be burdened in history by an irreparable iniquity.

Gentlemen of the jury, by your verdict of acquittal set an example of firmness. You feel unmistakably that this man is the honor of France. Zola struck, France herself strikes. And, in conclusion, I have but one word to say. Let your verdict signify several things: first, "Long live the army!" I too cry "Long live the army!" but also "Long live the Republic!" and "Long live France!" That is, gentlemen, "Long live the right! Long live eternal justice!"

JEAN BAPTISTE HENRI LACORDAIRE

(1802–1861)

PÈRE LACORDAIRE is celebrated, not only on account of his great eloquence, but because of the openness and boldness with which, without conceding any point of the Catholic creed, he endeavored to meet modern rationalism on its own grounds. He was born near Dijon, May 12th, 1802, and was educated for the law, which in 1824 he abandoned for theology. Ordained a priest in 1827, he became one of the leaders of Catholic Liberalism in France, and in 1830 was associate editor of a Progressivist paper called L'Avenir. Retiring from journalism because of his lack of ability to please both himself and the Pontifical Court at Rome, he made a great reputation by his sermons at Notre Dame, and by philosophical works, as a result of which he was elected to the Academy in 1860. He died November 22d, 1861.

«THE SACRED CAUSE OF THE HUMAN RACE»

(Panegyric of Daniel O'Connell, Delivered at Notre Dame in Paris, in 1847)

«THE claiming of rights» was for O'Connell the principle of force against tyranny. In fact, there is in right, as in all that is true, a real, an eternal, and an indestructible power, which can only disappear when right is no longer even named. Tyranny would be invincible, were it to succeed in destroying with its name the idea of right, in creating silence in the world in regard to right. It endeavors at least to approach that absolute term, and to lessen, by all the means of violence and corruption, the expression of justice. As long as a just soul remains, with boldness of speech, despotism is restless, troubled, fearing that eternity is conspiring against it. The rest is indifferent, or at least alarms it but little. Do you appeal to arms against it? It is but a battle. To a riot? It is but a matter of police. Violence is of time, right is heaven-born. What dignity, what force, there is in the right which speaks with calmness, with candor, with sincerity, from the heart of a good

man! Its nature is contagious; as soon as it is heard, the soul recognizes and embraces it; a moment sometimes suffices for a whole people to proclaim it and bend before it. It is said, no doubt, that the claiming of right is not always possible, and that there are times and places when oppression has become so inveterate that the language of right is as chimerical as its reality. It may be so; but this was not the position of O'Connell and of his country. O'Connell and Ireland could speak, write, petition, associate, elect magistrates and representatives. The rights of Ireland were despised, but not disarmed; and in this condition the doctrine of O'Connell was that of Christianity and reason. Liberty is a work of virtue, a holy work, and consequently an intellectual work.

But "rights must be claimed with perseverance." The emancipation of a people is not the work of a day; it infallibly encounters in the ideas, the passions, the interests, and the ever-intricate interweaving of human things, a thousand obstacles accumulated by time and which time alone is able to remove, provided that its course be aided by a parallel and an interrupted action. We must not, said O'Connell, simply speak to-day and to-morrow; write, petition, assemble to-day and to-morrow; we must continue to speak, write, petition, assemble, until the object is attained and right is satisfied. We must exhaust the patience of injustice and force the hand of Providence. You hear, gentlemen; this is not the school of desires vain and without virtue; it is the school of souls tempered for good, who know its price and do not wonder that it is great. O'Connell, indeed, has given to his lessons the sanction of his example; what he said, he did, and no life has ever been, even to its last moment, more indefatigable and better filled than his own. He labored before the future with the certainty which inspires the present; he was never surprised or discontented at not obtaining his end; he knew that he should not attain it during his life,—he doubted it at least,—and by the ardor of his actions it might have been supposed that he had but another step and another day before him. Who will count the number of assemblies in which he spoke and over which he presided, the petitions dictated by him, his journeys, his plans, his popular triumphs, and that inexpressible arsenal of ideas and facts which compose the fabulous tissue of his seventy-two years? He was the Hercules of liberty.

To perseverance in claiming rights he joined a condition which always appeared to him to be of sovereign importance, it

was that of being an "irreproachable organ of this work"; and to explain this maxim by his conduct we see from the first that, as he understood it, every servant of liberty must claim it equally and efficaciously for all, not only for his party, but for the adverse party; not only for his religion, but for all; not only for his country, but for the whole world. Mankind is one, and its rights are everywhere the same, even when the exercise of them differs according to the state of morals and minds. Whoever excepts a single man in his claim for right, whoever consents to the servitude of a single man, black or white, were it even but for a hair of his head unjustly bound, he is not a sincere man, and he does not merit to combat for the sacred cause of the human race. The public conscience will always reject the man who demands exclusive liberty, or even who is indifferent about the rights of others; for exclusive liberty is but a privilege, and the liberty which is indifferent about others is but a treason. We remark a nation, having arrived at a certain development of its social institutions, stopping short or even retrograding. Do not ask the reason. You may be sure that in the heart of that people there has been some secret sacrifice of right, and that the seeming defenders of its liberty, incapable of desiring liberty for others than themselves, have lost the prestige which conquers and saves, preserves and extends it. Degenerate sons of holy combats, their enervated language rolls in a vicious circle; to listen is already to have replied to them!

It was never thus with O'Connell; never, during fifty years, did his language once lose the invincible charm of sincerity. It vibrated for the rights of his enemy as for his own. It was heard denouncing oppression from wheresoever it came and upon whatsoever head it fell; thus he attracted to his cause, to the cause of Ireland, souls separated from his own by the abyss of the most profound disagreements; fraternal hands sought his own from the most distant parts of the world. It is because there is in the heart of the upright man who speaks for all, and who, in speaking for all, seems even sometimes to speak against himself; because there is there an omnipotence of logical and moral superiority which almost infallibly produces reciprocity.

Yes, Catholics, understand well, if you desire liberty for yourselves, you must desire it for all men and under all the heavens. If you demand it but for yourselves, it will never be granted to you; give it where you are masters that it may be given to you where you are slaves!

RATIONALISM AND MIRACLES

(Delivered at Notre Dame in Paris)

THE public life of Jesus Christ answers to his inner life, and his inner life confirms his public life. He declared himself to be God, he was believed to be God, he acted as God, and precisely because that position is one of marvelous strength, men have been forced to try their greatest efforts against it. History and common sense speaking too loudly in favor of Jesus Christ, it was needful to have recourse to metaphysics and physics in order to snatch from his hands at least the sceptre of miracles. Let us see whether they have succeeded. Two things are advanced against him. First, Jesus Christ wrought no miracles, because it is impossible. Secondly, his working miracles is of no importance, since everybody can work them, everybody has wrought them, everybody works them.

First, "Jesus Christ wrought no miracles because it is impossible." And why? "Because nature is subject to general laws, which make of its body a perfect and harmonious unity where each part answers to all; so that if one single point were violated, the whole would at once perish. Order, even when it comes from God, is not an arbitrary thing, able to destroy or change itself at will; order necessarily excludes disorder, and no greater disorder can be conceived in nature than that sovereign action which would possess the faculty of destroying its laws and its constitution. Miracles are impossible under these two heads; impossible as disorder, impossible because a partial violation of nature would be its total destruction."

That is to say, gentlemen, that it is impossible for God to manifest himself by the single act which publicly and instantaneously announces his presence, by the act of sovereignty. Whilst the lowest in the scale of being has the right to appear in the bosom of nature by the exercise of its proper force; whilst the grain of sand, called into the crucible of the chemist, answers to his interrogations by characteristic signs which range it in the registers of science, to God alone it should be denied to manifest his force in the personal measure that distinguishes him and makes him a separate being! Not only should God not have manifested himself, but it must be forever impossible for him to manifest himself, in virtue even of the order of which he is the

creator. To act, is to live; to appear, is to live; to communicate, is to live; but God can no longer act, appear, communicate himself; that is denied to him. Banished to the profound depths of his silent and obscure eternity, if we interrogate him, if we supplicate him, if we cry to him, he can only say to us — supposing, however, that he is able to answer us: "What would you have? I have made laws! Ask of the sun and the stars, ask of the sea and the sand upon its shores! As for me, my condition is fixed. I am nothing but repose, and the contemplative servant of the works of my hands!"

Ah! gentlemen, it is not thus that the whole human race has hitherto understood God. Men have understood him as a free and sovereign being; and, even if they have not always had a correct knowledge of his nature, they have at least never refused to him power and goodness. In all times and places, sure of these two attributes of their heavenly Father, they have offered up their ever-fervent prayer to him; they have asked all from him, and daily, upon their bended knees, they ask him to enlighten their minds, to give them uprightness of heart, health of body, to preserve them from scourge, to give them victory in war, prosperity in peace, the satisfaction of every want in every state and condition.

There is, perhaps, some poor woman here who hardly understands what I say. This morning she knelt by the bedside of her sick child; and, forsaken by all, without bread for the day, she clasped her hands and called to him who ripens the corn and creates charity. "O Lord," said she, "come to my help: O Lord, make haste to help me!" And even whilst I speak, numberless voices are lifted up towards God from all parts of the earth to ask from him things in which nature alone can do nothing, and in which those souls are persuaded that God can do all. Who, then, is deceived here? Is it the metaphysician, or the human race? And how has nature taught us to despise nature in order to trust in God? For it is not science that teaches us to pray; we pray in spite of science: and as there is nothing here below but science, nature, and God, if we pray in spite of science, it must be nature or God that teaches us to pray, and to believe with all our heart in the miracles of divine power and goodness. After this, whether nature become disorganized or not, or even if it must perish whenever the finger of God touches it, it is assuredly the very least concern to us. Nevertheless, out of

respect for certain minds, I will show that miracles do no violence to the natural order.

Nature, as I have already said, possesses three elements; namely, substances, forces, and laws. Substances are essentially variable; they change their form and their weight by combining and separating at each moment. Forces bear the same character; they increase and diminish, cohere, accumulate, or separate. They have nothing immutable but the mathematical laws, which at the same time govern forces and substances, and whence the order of the universe proceeds. The mobility of forces and substances spreads movement and life in nature; the immutability of mathematical laws maintains there an order which never fails. Without the first of these, all would be lifeless; without the second, all would be chaos. This established, what does God do when he works a miracle? Does he touch the principle of universal order which is the mathematical law? By no means. The mathematical law appertains to the region of ideas — that is to say, to the region of the eternal and the absolute; God can do nothing here, for it is himself. But he acts upon substances and upon forces, — upon substances which are created, upon forces which have their root in his supreme will. Like ourselves who, being subject to the general combinations of nature, nevertheless draw from our interior vitality movements which are in appearance contrary to the laws of weight, God acts upon the universe as we act upon our bodies. He applies somewhere the force needful to produce there an unusual movement; it is a miracle, because God alone, in the infinite fount of his will, — which is the centre of all created and possible forces, — is able to draw forth sufficient elements to act suddenly to this degree. If it please him to stop the sun, — to use a common expression, — he opposes to its projective force a force which counterbalances it, and which, by virtue even of the mathematical law, produces repose. It is not more difficult for him to stop the whole movement of the universe.

It is the same with all other miracles; it is a question of force, the use of which, so far from doing violence to the physical order, — which, indeed, would be of little moment, — returns to it of its own accord, and, moreover, maintains upon earth the moral and religious order, without which the physical order would not exist.

This objection answered, gentlemen, let us proceed to examine the second. We are told that miracles prove nothing, because all

doctrines have miracles in their favor, and because, by the help of a certain occult science, it is easy to perform them.

I boldly deny that any historical doctrine, that is, any doctrine founded in the full light of history by men authentically known, possesses miraculous works for its basis. At the present time, we have no example of it; no one, before our eyes, among so many instructors of the human race whom we see around us, has as yet dared to promise us the exercise of a power superior to the ordinary power which we dispose of. No one of our contemporaries has appeared in public giving sight to the blind and raising the dead to life. Extravagance has reached ideas and style only; it has not gone beyond. Returning from the present age back to Jesus Christ, we find no one, amongst the innumerable multitude of celebrated heresiarchs, who has been able to boast that he could command nature, and place the inspirations of his rebellious pride under the protection of miracles. Mahomet, at the same time heretic and unbeliever, did not attempt it any more than the others: this I have already said, and the Koran will more fully prove it to any one who will take the pains to read that plagiarism of the Bible made by a student of rhetoric at Mecca. Beyond Jesus Christ, in the ages claimed by history, what remains if we put aside Moses and the prophets — that is, the very ancestors of Jesus Christ? Shall we notice certain strange facts connected with Greece and Rome? Shall we speak of that augur, who, says Livy, cut a stone with a razor; or of that Vestal who drew along a vessel by her girdle, or even of the blind man cured by Vespasian? These facts, whatever they may be, are isolated and belong to no doctrine; they have provoked no discussion in the world, and have established nothing; they are not doctrinal facts. Now we are treating of miracles which have founded religious doctrines — the only miracles worthy of consideration; for it is evident that if God manifests himself by acts of sovereignty, it must be for some great cause worthy of himself and worthy of us, that is to say, for a cause which affects the eternal destinies of the whole human race. This places out of the question altogether all isolated facts, such as those related in the life of Apollonius of Thyana.

This personage is of the first century of the Christian era, and his life was written at a much later period by an Alexandrine philosopher called Philostratus, who designed to make of it a rival to the Gospel, and of Apollonius himself the counterpart

of Jesus Christ. A most singular physiognomy is here presented to us, but that is all. What has Apollonius of Thyana accomplished in regard to the doctrine? Where are his writings, his social works, the traces of his passage upon earth? He died in the morning of his life. Instead of certain equivocal facts, even had he removed mountains during his life, it would have been but a literary curiosity, an accident, a man, nothing.

Where, then, shall we look for doctrines founded in the light of history upon miraculous events? Where in the historical world is there another omnipotence than that of Jesus Christ? Where do we find other miracles than his and those of the saints who have chosen him for their master, and who have derived from him the power to continue what he had begun? Nothing appears upon the horizon; Jesus Christ alone remains, and his enemies, eternally attacking him, are able to bring against him nothing but doubts, and not a single fact equal or even analogous to him.

But do there not at least exist in nature certain occult forces which have since been made known to us and which Jesus Christ might have employed? I will name, gentlemen, the occult forces alluded to, and I will do so without any hesitation; they are called magnetic forces. And I might easily disembarrass myself of them, since science does not yet recognize them, and even proscribes them. Nevertheless I choose rather to obey my conscience than science. You invoke, then, the magnetic forces; I believe in them sincerely, firmly; I believe that their effects have been proved, although in a manner which is as yet incomplete, and probably will ever remain so, by instructed, sincere, and even by Christian men; I believe that these effects, in the great generality of cases, are purely natural; I believe that their secret has never been lost to the world, that it has been transmitted from age to age, that it has occasioned a multitude of mysterious actions whose trace is easily distinguished, and that it has now only left the shade of hidden transmissions because this age has borne upon its brow the sign of publicity. I believe all this. Yes, gentlemen, by a divine preparation against the pride of materialism, by an insult to science, which dates from a more remote epoch than we can reach, God has willed that there should be irregular forces in nature not reducible to precise formulæ, almost beyond the reach of scientific verification. He has so willed it, in order to prove to men who slumber in the dark-

ness of the senses that even independently of religion there remained within us rays of a higher order, fearful gleams cast upon the invisible world, a kind of crater by which our soul, freed for a moment from the terrible bonds of the body, flies away into spaces which it cannot fathom, from whence it brings back no remembrance, but which give it a sufficient warning that the present order hides a future order before which ours is but nothingness.

All this I believe is true; but it is also true that these obscure forces are confined within limits which show no sovereignty over the natural order. Plunged into a factitious sleep, man sees through opaque bodies at certain distances; he names remedies for soothing and even for healing the diseases of the body; he seems to know things that he knew not, and that he forgets on the instant of his waking; by his will he exercises great empire over those with whom he is in magnetic communication; all this is difficult, painful, mixed up with uncertainty and prostration. It is a phenomenon of vision much more than of operation, a phenomenon which belongs to the prophetic and not to the miraculous order. A sudden cure, an evident act of sovereignty, has nowhere been witnessed. Even in the prophetic order, nothing is more pitiful.

It would seem that this extraordinary vision should at least reveal to us something of that future which may be called the present future. It does nothing of this. What has "magnetism" foretold during the last fifty years? Let it tell us, not what will happen in a thousand years, not what will happen the day after to-morrow even, but what will happen to-morrow morning. All those who dispose of our destinies are living,—they speak, they write, they alarm our susceptibility; but let them show us the certain result of their action in a single public matter. Alas! magnetism, which was to change the world, has not even been able to become an agent of police; it strikes the imagination as much by its sterility as by its singularity. It is not a principle, it is a ruin. Thus, on the desolate banks of the Euphrates, in the place where Babylon once stood and where that famous tower was begun which, to speak like Bossuet, was to bear even to heaven the testimony of the antique power of man, the traveler finds ruins blasted by the thunderbolt, and almost superhuman in their magnitude. He stoops, and eagerly gathers up a fragment of brick; he discovers characters upon it which belong, doubtless,

to the primitive writing of the human race; but vain are his efforts to decipher them, the sacred fragment falls back again from his hands upon the colossus calcined by fire: it is nothing now but a broken tile, which even curiosity despises.

I look around, gentlemen; I see nothing more; Jesus Christ is alone.

Perhaps, however, you may yet say to me: If Jesus Christ wrought miracles during his life, and even in the early days of the Church, why does he do so no longer? Why? Alas, gentlemen, he works miracles every day, but you do not see them. He works them with less profusion, because the moral and social miracle, the miracle which needed time, is wrought, and before your eyes. When Jesus Christ laid the foundations of his Church, it was needful for him to obtain faith in a work then commencing; now it is formed, although not yet finished: You behold it, you touch it, you compare it, you measure it, you judge whether it is a human work. Why should God be prodigal of miracles to those who do not see the miracle? Why, for instance, should I lead you to the mountains of the Tyrol, to see prodigies which a hundred thousand of your contemporaries have witnessed there during the last fifteen years? Why should I pick up a stone in the quarry when the Church is built? The monument of God is standing, every power has touched it, every science has scrutinized it, every blasphemy has cursed it; examine it well, it is there before you. Between earth and heaven, as says the Comte de Maistre, it has been suspended these eighteen centuries; if you do not see it what would you see? In a celebrated parable Jesus Christ speaks of a certain rich man who said to Abraham: "Send some one from the dead to my brethren." And Abraham answers: "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they believe, though one rose from the dead." The Church is Moses, the Church is all the prophets, the Church is the living miracle; he who sees not the living, how should he see the dead?

ALPHONSE MARIE LOUIS LAMARTINE

(1790–1869)

Known outside of France chiefly by his 'History of the Girondists' and similar historical works, Lamartine is ranked by his countrymen next to Hugo as a poet and orator. He shows the versatility which is illustrated better perhaps in the public life of Paris than it is anywhere else in the world. He was by turn poet, politician, essayist, orator, and writer of the history he had helped to make. He was born at Mâcon, October 21st, 1790. Going abroad at the age of twenty to complete his education, and spending much of the time in Italy, he published, ten years later, his 'Méditations Poétiques,' which greatly accelerated the impetus of France towards the Romantic school, afterwards developed by Victor Hugo. From 1820, when his first work appeared, until 1863, Lamartine published one successful volume after another. He was elected a member of the French Academy in 1830. During the Revolution of 1848 he was Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Provisional Government. Many of the speeches which he made during that period he has reported in the 'History of the Revolution of 1848,' among them the speech of May 7th, 1848, in which, as he says, "in the name and place of the President of the Provisional Government he gave an account of the acts of the Revolution." He died at Paris, March 1st, 1869.

THE REVOLUTION OF 1848

(Delivered May 7th, 1848, in the National Assembly at Paris)

Citizen-Representatives of the People:—

At the moment of your entrance on the exercise of your sovereignty—at the moment of our resigning into your hands the special powers with which the Revolution provisionally invested us—we wish, in the first place, to render you an account of the situation in which we found ourselves, and in which you also find the nation.

A revolution burst forth on the twenty-fourth of February. The people overthrew the throne. They swore upon its ruins thenceforth to reign alone, and entirely by themselves. They

charged us to provide temporarily for the necessity of the interregnum which they had to traverse to reach, without disorder or anarchy, their unanimous and final power. Our first thought was to abridge this interregnum by immediately convoking the national representation, in which alone reside right and force. Simply citizens, without any other summons than public peril, without any other title than our devotedness, trembling to accept, hastening to restore the deposit of national destinies, we have had but one ambition,—that of resigning the dictatorship to the bosom of popular sovereignty.

The throne overturned, the dynasty crumbling of itself, we did not proclaim the Republic; it proclaimed itself, by the voice of an entire people;—we did nothing but register the cry of the nation.

Our first thought, as well as the first requirement of the country, after the proclamation of the Republic, was the re-establishment of order and security in Paris. In this labor,—which would have been more difficult and more meritorious at another time and in another country,—we were aided by the concurrence of the citizens. While holding in one hand the musket which had just given the deathblow to royalty, this magnanimous people with the other raised up the vanquished and the wounded of the opposite party. They protected the life and property of the inhabitants. They preserved the public monuments. Each citizen of Paris was at once the soldier of liberty and the voluntary magistrate of order. History has recorded the innumerable acts of heroism, of probity, and disinterestedness, which have characterized these first days of the Republic. Till this time the people had sometimes been flattered by allusions to their virtues; posterity, which is no flatterer, will find all these expressions beneath the dignity of the people of Paris in this crisis.

It was they who inspired us with the first decree destined to give its true signification to victory,—the decree of the abolition of the penalty of death in political cases. They suggested, adopted, and ratified it, by the acclamation of two hundred thousand voices, on the square and quay of the Hôtel de Ville. Not a single exclamation of anger protested against it. France and Europe understood that God had his inspirations in the mass, and that a revolution inaugurated by grandeur of soul would be pure as an idea, magnanimous as a sentiment, and holy as a virtue.

The red flag, presented for a moment,—not as a symbol of menace and disorder, but as a temporary flag of victory,—was laid aside by the combatants themselves, to cover the Republic with that tricolored flag which had shaded its cradle, and led the glory of our arms over every continent and every ocean.

After having established the authority of government in Paris, it was necessary to make the Republic recognized in the departments, the colonies, in Algeria, and the army. The telegraphic news and couriers were enough. France, her colonies and armies, recognized their own idea in the idea of the Republic. There was no resistance from a single hand or voice, nor from one free heart in France, to the installation of the new government.

Our second thought was for the exterior. Europe awaited, in doubt, the first word from France. This first word was the abolition, in fact and right, of the reactionary treaties of 1815; the restoration of liberty to our foreign policy; the declaration of peace to the territories; of sympathy to nations; of justice, loyalty, and moderation, to governments. France, in this manifesto, laid aside her ambition, but did not lay aside her ideas. She permitted her principle to shine out. This was all her warfare. The special report of the minister of foreign affairs will show you the fruits of this noonday system of diplomacy, and the legitimate and great fruits it must yield to the influences of France.

This policy required the minister of war to employ measures in harmony with the system of armed negotiation. He energetically re-established a discipline scarcely shaken, and honorably recalled to Paris the army, removed temporarily from our walls, that the people might have an opportunity of arming themselves. The people, henceforth invincible, did not delay summoning with loud cries their brethren of the army, not only as the safeguard, but as the ornament, of the capital. In Paris the army was only an honorary garrison, designed to prove to our brave soldiers that the capital of the country belongs to all her children.

We decreed, moreover, the formation of four armies of observation: the army of the Alps, the army of the Rhine, the army of the north, and the army of the Pyrenees.

Our navy — confided to the hands of the same minister, as a second army of France — was rallied under its commanders, in a discipline governed by a confidence in its vigilance. The fleet of

Toulon sailed to display our colors to nations friendly to France on the shores of the Mediterranean.

The army of Algiers had neither an hour nor a thought of hesitation. The Republic and the country were united in their view by a feeling of the same duty. A leader, whose republican name, sentiments, and talents, were at once pledges for the army and the revolution, General Cavaignac, received the command of Algeria.

The corruption which had penetrated the holiest institutions compelled the minister of war to adopt expurgations demanded by the public voice. It was necessary promptly to separate justice from policy. The minister made the separation with pain, but with inflexibility.

In proclaiming the Republic, the cry of France had not only proclaimed a form of government, but a principle. This principle was practical democracy, equality in rights, fraternity in institutions. The revolution accomplished by the people ought, according to us, to be organized for the profit of the people, by a series of fraternal and guardian institutions, proper to confer regularly on all the conditions of individual dignity, instruction, intelligence, wages, morality, the elements of labor, competence, aid, and advancement to property, which would suppress the servile name of proletary, and would elevate the laborer to the level of the rights, duties, and well-being of the firstborn of prosperity; to raise up and enrich the one, without debasing and degrading the other; to preserve property, and render it more prolific and sacred, by multiplying it and dividing it in the hands of the greatest number; distributing the taxes in such a manner as to make the burden fall heaviest on the strongest, by easing and succoring the weakest; to create by the state the labor which might accidently fail, from the fact of the timidity of capital, so that there should not be a laborer in France whose bread and wages should fail him; and, finally, to study with the workmen themselves the practical and true phenomena of association, and the yet problematical theories of systems, and to seek conscientiously their applications, and to ascertain their errors; — such was the idea of the provisional government, in all the decrees; whose execution or examination it confided to the minister of finance, the minister of public works, and to the commissioner of the Luxembourg, — the laboratory of ideas, the preparatory and statistical congress of labor and employment, enlightened by

studious and intelligent delegates from all the laborious professions, presided over by two members of the Government itself.

The sudden fall of the monarchy, the disorder of the finances, the momentary displacement of an immense mass of factory laborers, the shocks which these masses of unoccupied arms might have given society, if their reason, their patience, and their practical resignation, had not been a miracle of popular reason, and the admiration of the world; the recoverable debt of nearly a thousand millions, which the fallen Government had accumulated on the first two months of the Republic; the industrial and commercial crisis universal on the continent and in England, coinciding with the political crisis in Paris; the enormous accumulation of railway shares and other fictitious property thrown into the hands of agents and bankers by the panic of capital; finally, the imagination of the country, which is carried beyond the truth at moments of political convulsion and social terror,—had exhausted active capital, caused the disappearance of specie, and suspended free and voluntary labor, the only labor sufficient for thirty-five millions of men. It was necessary to supply it temporarily, or be false to all the principles, all the precautions, and all the necessities of the Republic that can be relieved. The minister of finance will tell you how this prostration of labor and credit was provided for, while waiting for the moment now reached, when the restoration of confidence to men's minds would restore capital to the hands of manufacturers, and wages to labor; when your wisdom and national power will be equal to all difficulties.

The ministry of public instruction and worship, confided to the same hand, was for the Government a manifestation of intention, and for the country a presage of the new position which the Republic wished and ought to assume, under the twofold necessity of national enlightenment, and a more real independence of equal and free worship before conscience and the law.

The ministry of agriculture and commerce, a ministry foreign from its nature to politics, could only prepare with zeal, and sketch with sagacity, the new institutions summoned to fertilize the first of useful arts. It extended the hand of state over the suffering interests of commerce, which you alone can raise up by making them secure.

Such were our different and incessant cares. Thanks to that Providence, which has never more clearly manifested its intervention in the cause of nations and the human mind; thanks to

the people themselves, who have never better shown the treasures of reason, civil virtue, generosity, patience, and morality,— the true civilization which fifty years of imperfect liberty have elaborated in their hearts,— we succeeded in accomplishing, very imperfectly without doubt, but yet not unhappily, a part of the immense and perilous task with which events had burthened us.

We have founded the Republic, a government declared impossible in France on any other conditions than foreign war, civil war, anarchy, prisons, and the scaffold. We have displayed a Republic, happily compatible with European peace, with internal security, with voluntary order, with individual liberty, with the sweetness and amenity of manners of a nation for whom hatred is a punishment, and harmony a national instinct.

We have promulgated the great principles of equality, fraternity, and unity, which must, in their daily development in our laws, enacted by all and for all, accomplish the unity of the people by the unity of representation.

We have rendered the right of citizenship universal, by rendering the right of election universal; and universal suffrage has responded to us.

We have armed the entire people in the National Guard, and the entire people have answered us by devoting the arms we confided to it to the unanimous defense of the nation, order, and law.

We have gone through the interregnum with no other executive force than the entirely unarmed moral authority, whose right the nation voluntarily recognized in us; and these people consented to suffer themselves to be governed by our words, our counsels, and their own generous inspirations.

We have passed more than two months of crisis, of cessation of labor, of misery, of elements of political agitation, of social sufferings and passions, accumulated in countless masses in a capital with a population of a million and a half, without property having been violated, without anger menacing a single life, without one repression, one proscription, one political imprisonment, without one drop of blood shed in our name, saddening the government in Paris. We can descend from this long dictatorship to the public square, and mingle with the people without one citizen being able to ask: "What hast thou done with a citizen?"

Before summoning the National Assembly to Paris, we completely assured its security and independence by arming and organizing the National Guard, and giving you an entire armed people for your protection. There is no longer a possibility of faction in a Republic where there is no longer a division between enfranchised and disfranchised citizens, between armed and unarmed citizens. All have their rights, all have their army. In such a State insurrection is no longer the extreme right of resistance to oppression; it would be a crime. He who separates himself from the people is no longer of the people. This is the unanimity we have created; perpetuate it, for it is the common safety.

Citizen-representatives! our work is accomplished; yours now begins. Even the presentation of a plan of government, or a project of constitution, on our part, would have been a rash prolongation of power, or an infringement on your sovereignty. We disappear the moment you rise to receive the Republic from the hands of the people. We will only permit ourselves a single counsel and a single wish, in the name of our citizenship, and not as members of the provisional government. This wish, citizens, France utters with us; it is the voice of circumstance. Do not waste time, that precious element of human crises. After having absorbed the sovereignty in yourselves, do not suffer a new interregnum to clog the wheels of the country. Let not a commission of Government, springing from your body, allow power to fluctuate a single instant longer, precariously and provisionally, in a country which has need of power and security. Let a committee on a constitution, emanating from your suffrages, report, without delay, for your deliberation and vote, the simple, brief, and democratic mechanism of a constitution, whose organic and secondary laws you can afterwards discuss at your leisure.

In the meanwhile, as members of the Government, we restore to you our powers.

We also confidently submit all our acts to your judgment, only we pray you to take into consideration the period and the difficulties. Our conscience reproaches us with nothing intentionally wrong. Providence has favored our efforts. Grant an amnesty to our involuntary dictatorship. We ask but to return to the ranks of good citizens.

Only may history record with indulgence, beneath and at a great distance from the great deeds achieved by France, the story of these three months, passed in the void between a fallen Monarchy and a Republic to be enthroned; and may it, instead of the obscure and forgotten names of men who devoted themselves to the common safety, inscribe on its pages two names only: the name of the people, who saved everything, and the name of God, who blessed everything, in the foundation of the Republic.

JOHN LANSING

(1754–1829)

JOHN LANSING, of New York, was Chief-Justice and Chancellor of the State, and he filled other positions of importance, but his place in history depends chiefly on his pronounced opposition to Hamilton in the New York Convention of 1788. He was born in New York in 1754, and educated for the bar. During the Revolutionary War he served under General Schuyler as military secretary. He was afterwards elected to several local offices, and in 1784 to Congress. In 1790 he became a member of the State Supreme Court, and in 1801 State Chancellor. He died in 1829. His speech of June 28th, 1788, answering Hamilton, is one of the most emphatic delivered during the session of the convention.

ANSWERING ALEXANDER HAMILTON

(Delivered June 28th, 1788, in the New York Convention, Called to Consider the Federal Constitution)

THIS clause [the revenue clause], Mr. Chairman, is by every one considered as one of the most important in the Constitution. The subject has been treated in a very diffusive manner. Among all the ingenious remarks that have been made, some are little more than repetitions; others are not very applicable or interesting. I shall beg leave to pass a few strictures on the paragraph; and, in my reply, shall confine myself to the arguments which have been advanced. The committee have been informed that it embraces a great variety of objects, and that it gives the General Government a power to lay all kinds of taxes; that it confers a right of laying excises on all articles of American manufacture, of exacting an impost, in which the State governments cannot interfere, and of laying direct taxes without restriction. These powers reach every possible source of revenue. They will involve a variety of litigations, which can only come under the cognizance of the judiciary of the United States. Hence it must appear that these powers will effect, in an unlim-

ited manner, the property of the citizens; that they will subject them, in a great degree, to the laws of the Union, and give an extensive jurisdiction to the Federal courts. The objects of the amendment are to prevent excises from being laid on the manufactures of the United States, and to provide that direct taxes shall not be imposed till requisitions have been made and proved fruitless.

All the reasoning of the gentleman goes to prove that government ought to possess all the resources of a country. But so far as it respects government in general, it does not apply to this question. Giving the principle its full force, it does not prove that our Federal Government ought to have all the resources; because this Government is but a part of a system, the whole of which should possess the means of support. It has been advanced repeatedly by the gentleman that the powers of the United States should, like their objects, be national and general. It appears to him proper, therefore, that the nature of their resources should be correspondent. Sir, it has been declared that we can no longer place confidence in requisitions. A great deal of argument has been spent on this point. The gentleman constantly considers the old mode of requisitions, and that proposed, in the same view. But not one of us has ever contended for requisitions in the form prescribed in the existing Confederation; hence the reasoning about the inefficacy of the ancient mode has no application to the one recommended; which rests on different principles, and has a sanction of which the other is totally destitute. In the one instance, it is necessary to execute the requisitions of Congress on the States collectively. There is no way of doing this but by coercing a whole community, which cannot be effected. But the amendment proposes to carry the laws of Congress to the doors of individuals. This circumstance will produce an entire change in the operation of requisitions, and will give them an inefficiency which otherwise they could not have. In this view, it will appear that the gentleman's principles respecting the character and effects of requisitions can have no application in this dispute. Much pains have been taken to show that requisitions have not answered the public exigencies. All this has been fully admitted in former stages of the debate. It was said by a gentleman, yesterday, that though considerable sums of money had been paid by the people, it was by way of bounties to the soldiers; which was a coercion on individuals. If,

then, this coercion had its effect, certainly its operation, upon the proposed plan, will be much more forcible. It has been said that, in sudden emergencies, all the resources of the country might be required; and that the supreme head ought to possess the power of providing for the public wants, in every degree. It is an undoubted fact that, in all government, it is extremely difficult, on the spur of the occasion, to raise money by taxes. Nor is it necessary. In a commercial country, persons will always be found to advance money to the Government, and to wait the regular operation of the revenue laws. It depends on the security of the taxes, and the certainty of being refunded. This amendment does not diminish the security or render the fund precarious. The certainty of repayment is as well established as if the Government could levy the taxes originally on individuals.

Sir, have the States ever shown a disposition not to comply with the requisitions? We shall find that, in almost every instance, they have, so far as passing a law of compliance, been carried into execution. To what, then, are the delinquencies to be attributed? They must be to the impoverished state of the country. If the State governments have been unable to compel the people to obey their laws, will Congress be able to coerce them? Will the Federal taxes be better paid? But, sir, no reasonable man will be apprehensive of the noncompliance of the States, under the operation of the proposed plan. The right of enforcing the requisitions will furnish the strongest motive for the performance of the Federal duty. With this powerful inducement, there is hardly a possibility of failure. It has been asked: Why give the individual States the preference? Why not suffer the General Government to apply to the people in the first instance, without the formality of a requisition? This question has been repeatedly asked, and as often answered. It is because the State legislatures are more nearly connected with the people, and more acquainted with their situation and wants. They better know when to enforce or relax their laws; to embrace objects or relinquish them, according to change of circumstances; they have but a few varying interests to comprehend in general provisions. Congress do not possess these advantages; they cannot have so complete an acquaintance with the people; their laws, being necessarily uniform, cannot be calculated for the diversity of objects which present themselves to Government. It is possible that the men delegated may have interests different from those of the

people. It is observed that we have had experiences of different kinds of taxes, which have been executed by different officers,—for instance, County and State taxes,—and that there has been no clashing or interference. But, sir, in these cases, if any dispute arise, the parties appeal to a common tribunal; but if collectors be appointed by different governments, and authorized by different laws, the Federal officer will appeal to a Federal court; his adversary will appeal to a State court. Will not this create contests respecting jurisdiction? But the Constitution declares that the laws of the United States shall be supreme. There is no doubt, therefore, that they must prevail in every controversy; and everything which has a tendency to obstruct the force of the General Government must give way.

An honorable gentleman from New York has remarked that the idea of danger to State governments can only originate in a distempered fancy; he stated that they were necessary component parts of the system, and informed us how the President and Senators were to be elected; his conclusion is that the liberties of the people cannot be endangered. I shall only observe that, however fanciful these apprehensions may appear to him, they have made serious impressions upon some of the greatest and best men. Our fears arise from the experience of all ages and our knowledge of the dispositions of mankind. I believe the gentlemen cannot point out an instance of the rights of a people remaining for a long period inviolate. The history of Europe has afforded remarkable examples of the loss of liberty by the usurpations of rulers. In the early periods of the Government of the United Netherlands, the magistrates were elected by the people; but now they have become hereditary. The Venetians are, at this day, governed by an aristocracy. The senators, once the representatives of the people, were enabled, by gradual encroachments, at last to declare themselves perpetual. The office has since become hereditary, and the Government entirely despotic. The gentleman has adduced one historical example to prove that the members of a government, in the contests with the head, generally prevail. He observed that in the struggles between the feudal sovereigns of Europe and their barons the latter were usually victorious. If this were true, I believe the operations of such a system as the feudal will not warrant the general inference he draws. The feudal barons were obliged to assist the monarch in his wars with their persons and those of

their vassals. This, in the early periods, was the sovereign's sole dependence. Not possessed of pecuniary revenues, or a standing military force, he was, whenever the barons withdrew their aid, or revolted against his authority, reduced to a very feeble situation. While he possessed not the means of carrying on his wars, independently of his nobles, his power was insignificant, and he was unsuccessful. But, sir, the moment he gained command of revenues and an army, as soon as he obtained the sword and the purse, the current of success was turned, and his superiority over his barons was regularly augmented, and at last established. The barons, in their early wars, possessed other peculiar advantages; their number was small, they were actuated by one principle, and had one common object; — it was to reduce still lower the feeble powers of the monarch; they were therefore easily brought to act in concert. Sir, wherever the revenues and the military force are, there will rest the power; the members or the head will prevail, as one or the other possesses these advantages. The gentleman, in his reasoning, has taken the wrong part of the example — that part which bears no resemblance to our system. Had he come down to a later period, he would, indeed, have seen the resemblance, and his historical facts would have directly militated against his argument. Sir, if you do not give the State governments a power to protect themselves, if you leave them no other check upon Congress than the power of appointing Senators, they will certainly be overcome, like the barons of whom the gentleman has spoken. Neither our civil nor our militia officers will afford many advantages of opposition against the National Government; if they have any powers, it will ever be difficult to concentrate them, or give them a uniform direction. Their influence will hardly be felt, while the greater number of lucrative and honorable places, in the gift of the United States, will establish an influence which will prevail in every part of the continent.

It has been admitted by an honorable gentleman from New York [Mr. Hamilton], that the State governments are necessary to secure the liberties of the people. He has urged several forcible reasons why they ought to be preserved under the new system; and he has treated the idea of the General and State governments being hostile to each other as chimerical. I am, however, firmly persuaded that a hostility between them will exist. This was a received opinion in the late convention at Phila-

delphia. That honorable gentleman was then fully convinced that it would exist, and argued, with much decision and great plausibility, that the State governments ought to be subverted, at least so far as to leave them only corporate rights, and that, even in that situation, they would endanger the existence of the General Government. But the honorable gentleman's reflections have probably induced him to correct that sentiment.

DIONYSIUS LARDNER

(1793–1859)

DURING the second quarter of the nineteenth century, Doctor Lardner did the work as a popular educator in science which was done in the last quarter of the century by such lecturers as Professor Proctor. His lectures and addresses frequently show the striking eloquence illustrated in the exordium of his address, 'The Plurality of Worlds.' He was born at Dublin, April 3d, 1793, and educated at Trinity College in Dublin, from which he graduated in theology in 1817. Although professionally a clergyman, the great work of his life was done in science. Appointed Professor of Natural Philosophy and Astronomy in London University in 1827, he made a reputation by his scientific labors so great that the course of lectures on scientific subjects he delivered in the United States from 1841 to 1844 were largely attended, and were afterwards collected and published in book form. In 1845 he took up his residence in Paris, where for the most part he lived until his death, April 29th, 1859.

THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS

(Exordium of an Address Delivered during His American Tour, 1841–44)

WHEN we walk forth on a serene night and direct our view to the aspect of the heavens, there are certain reflections which will present themselves to every mind gifted with the slightest power of contemplation. Are those shining orbs which so richly decorate the firmament peopled with creatures endowed, like ourselves, with reason to discover, with sense to love, and with imagination to expand toward their limitless perfection the attributes of him of "whose fingers the heavens are the work"? Has he who "made man lower than the angels to crown him," with the glory of discovering that light in which he has "decked himself as with a garment," also made other creatures with like powers and like destinies; with dominion over the works of his hands, and having all things "put in subjection

under their feet"? And are those resplendent globes which roll in silent majesty through the measureless abysses of space the dwellings of such beings? These are questions which will be asked, and which will be answered. These are inquiries against which neither the urgency of business nor the allurements of pleasure can block up the avenues of the mind. These are questions that have been asked, and that will continue to be asked, by all who view the earth as an individual of that little cluster of worlds called the solar system.

Those whose information on topics of this nature is limited would be prompted, in seeking the satisfaction of such inquiries, to look immediately for direct evidence; and consequently to appeal to the telescope. Such an appeal would, however, be fruitless. Vast as are the powers of that instrument, and great the improvements which have been conferred upon it, it still falls infinitely short of the ability to give direct evidence on such inquiries. What will a telescope do for us in regard to the examination of the heavenly bodies, or, indeed, of any distant object? It will accomplish this, and nothing more; it will place us at a less distance from the object to which we direct our view; it will enable us to approach it within a certain limit of distance, and to behold it as we should do without a telescope at the lesser distances. But, strictly speaking, it cannot accomplish even this; for to suppose it did would be to imagine it to possess all the admirable optical perfection of the eye. That instrument, however nearly it approaches the organ of vision in its qualities, is still deficient in some of the attributes which have been conferred upon the eye by its Maker. It is found that in proportion as we augment the magnifying power of the telescope, we diminish both the quantity of light upon the object we behold, and also the distinctness of its features and outlines. These, and some other circumstances peculiar to the telescope, which need not be particularly detailed now, impose a limit on the magnifying powers that are practically available in inquiries of this kind.

Let us, however, suppose that we could resort to the use of a telescope having the magnifying power of a thousand in examining any of the heavenly bodies: what would such an instrument do for us? It would, in fact, place us a thousand times nearer to the object that we are desirous to examine, and thus enable us to see that object as we should see it at that diminished distance without a telescope at all. Such is the extent of the aid which

we should derive from the telescope. Now, let us see what this aid would effect. Take the case of the moon, the nearest body in the universe to the earth. The distance of that object is about two hundred and forty thousand miles; the telescope would then place us about two hundred and forty miles from it. Could we at the distance of two hundred and forty miles distinctly, or even indistinctly, see a man, a horse, an elephant, or any other natural object? Could we discern any artificial structure? Assuredly not! But take the case of one of the planets. When Mars is nearest to the earth, its distance is about fifty million of miles. Such a telescope would place us at a distance of fifty thousand miles from it. What object could we expect to see at fifty thousand miles distance? The planet Venus, when nearest the earth, is at a distance something less than thirty million of miles, but at that distance her dark hemisphere is turned toward us; and when a considerable portion of her enlightened hemisphere is visible, her distance is not less than that of Mars. All the other planets, when nearest to the earth, are at much greater distances. As the stars lie infinitely more remote than the most remote planet, it is needless here to add anything respecting them.

It is plain, then, that the telescope cannot afford any direct evidence on the question whether the planets, like the earth, are inhabited globes. Yet, although science has not given direct answers to these questions, it has supplied a body of circumstantial evidence bearing upon them of an extremely interesting nature. Modern discovery has collected together a mass of facts connected with the position and motions, the physical character and conditions, and the parts played in the solar system by the several globes of which that system is composed, which forms a body of analogies bearing on this inquiry, even more cogent and convincing than the proofs on the strength of which we daily dispose of the property and lives of our fellow-citizens, and hazard our own.

In considering the earth as a dwelling-place suited to man and to the creatures which it has pleased his Maker to place in subjection to him, there is a mutual fitness and adaptation observable among a multitude of arrangements which cannot be traced to, and which, indeed, obviously cannot arise from any general mechanical law by which the motions and changes of mere material masses are observed to be governed. It is in

these conveniences and luxuries with which our dwelling has been so considerately furnished that we see the beneficent intentions of its Creator more immediately manifested than by any great physical or mechanical laws, however imposing or important. If — having a due knowledge of our natural necessities — of our appetites and passions — of our susceptibilities of pleasure and pain — in fine, of our physical organization — we were for the first time introduced to this glorious earth with its balmy atmosphere — its pure and translucent waters — the life and beauty of its animal and vegetable kingdoms — with its attraction upon the matter of our own bodies just sufficiently great to give them the requisite stability, and yet not so great as to deprive them of the power of free and rapid motion — with its intervals of light and darkness, giving an alternation of labor and rest nicely corresponding with our muscular power — with its grateful succession of seasons, and its moderate extremes of temperature, so justly suited to our organization: with all this fitness before us, could we hesitate to infer that such a place must have been provided expressly for our habitation? If, then, the discoveries of modern science disclose to us in each planet, which, like our own, rolls in regulated periods round the sun, provisions, in all respects similar,— if they are proved to be habitations similarly built, ventilated, warmed, illuminated, and furnished — supplied with the same alternations of light and darkness by the same expedient — with the same pleasant succession of seasons — the same geographical diversity of climates — the same agreeable distribution of land and water,— can we doubt that such structures have been provided as the abodes of beings in all respects resembling ourselves? The strong presumption raised by such proofs is converted into a moral certainty, when it is shown from physical analogies of irresistible force that such bodies are the creation of the same Hand that raised the round world and launched it into space.

HUGH LATIMER

(*c.* 1490–1555)

THE exact date of Latimer's birth is in dispute, but beyond all doubt it was on October 16th, 1555, that he was burned at Oxford, "stroking his face with his hands and as it were bathing in the fire." While Bishop of Worcester, under Henry VIII., he himself had officiated as priest at the burning of Forest, a friar who taught religious doctrine which seemed as treasonable to Henry as Latimer's did to Mary. Under the Tudors and Stuarts, even until the close of Charles the Second's reign, the stake and scaffold were used without hesitation as means of suppressing heresy. It was the custom, however, to convict, not for heresy, but for high treason, so that not a few who went to the stake or died on the gallows, expecting the heretic's crown of martyrdom, appear on the court records as traitors. David Lewis, Catholic Bishop of Llandaff and Jesuit, who was hanged, disemboweled, and quartered under Charles II., for "treasonably" acting as priest under authority from the Pope instead of the King, said on the scaffold: "I die for conscience and religion, and dying upon such good scores, as far as human frailty permits, I die with alacrity,"—a noble saying, even if it does not equal in picturesque eloquence Latimer's greeting to Ridley when they met at the stake: "Be of good comfort, Master Ridley, and play the man, for we shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England as I trust shall never be put out." After saying this, Latimer "received the flame as it were embracing it," and "soon died, as it appeared, with very little pain or none."

He was born in Leicestershire somewhere between 1472 and 1490,—the best authorities fixing the date at about 1490. His father, though a small yeoman farmer, educated him at Cambridge "in the knowledge of all good literature," and at home was "diligent to teach him to shoot." After becoming a priest and obtaining the benefice of West Kington, he was cited before the Bishop of London on a charge of heresy, and on April 10th, 1532, recanted, and kept his place in the priesthood. In 1534 he was made a Royal Chaplain, and in 1535 Bishop of Worcester, a position he resigned four years later because of differences of opinion with the King, through whose favor he had been promoted. Under Edward VI. he was again in favor at Court, but on the accession of Mary he recognized his martyrdom as inevit-

able, and waited for it with the same resolution he shows in his sermon, 'Duties and Respect of Judges.' His style as an orator is admirable, not surpassed in English prose until Bacon began to speak and write.

DUTIES AND RESPECT OF JUDGES

I will tell you, my lord judges, if ye consider this matter well, ye should be more afraid of the poor widow than of a nobleman with all the friends and power that he can make. But nowadays the judges be afraid to hear a poor man against the rich insomuch they will either pronounce against him, or so drive off the poor man's suit that he shall not be able to go through with it. The greatest man in a realm cannot so hurt a judge as the poor widow, such a shrewd turn she can do him. And with what armor I pray you? She can bring the Judge's skin over his ears, and never lay hands upon him. And how is that? *Lacrimæ miserorum descendunt ad maxillas*, the tears of the poor fall down upon their cheeks, *et ascendunt ad cælum*, and go up to heaven, and cry for vengeance before God, the judge of widows, the father of widows and orphans. Poor people be oppressed even by laws. *Væ iis qui condunt leges iniquas.* Woe worth to them that make evil laws. If woe be to them that make laws against the poor, what shall be to them that hinder and mar good laws? *Quid facietis in die ultionis?* What will ye do in the day of vengeance when God will visit you? He saith he will hear the tears of poor women when he goeth on visitation. For their sakes he will hurt the judge, be he never so high. *Deus transfert regna.* He will, for widows' sakes, change realms, bring them into subjection, pluck the judges' skins over their heads.

Cambyses was a great emperor, such another as our master is; he had many lord deputies, lord presidents, and lieutenants under him. It is a great while ago since I read the history. It chanced he had under him in one of his dominions a briber, a gift-taker, a gratifier of rich men; he followed gifts, as fast as he that followed the pudding, a hand-maker in his office, to make his son a great man, as the old saying is: "Happy is the child whose father goeth to the devil."

The cry of the poor widow came to the emperor's ear, and caused him to flay the judge quick, and lay his skin in his chair

of judgment, that all judges that should give judgment afterward should sit in the same skin. Surely it was a goodly sign, a goodly monument, the sign of the judge's skin; I pray God we may once see the sign of the skin in England. Ye will say, peradventure, that this is cruelly and uncharitably spoken; no, no, I do it charitably for a love I bear to my country. God saith, *ego visitabo*, I will visit. God hath two visitations. The first is when he revealeth his word by preachers, and where the first is accepted the second cometh not. The second visitation is vengeance. He went a visitation, when he brought the judge's skin over his ears. If his word be despised, he cometh with his second visitation with vengeance.

Noah preached God's word an hundred years, and was laughed to scorn, and called an old doating fool. Because they would not accept this first visitation, God visited the second time; he poured down showers of rain till all the world was drowned.

Lot was a visitor of Sodom and Gomorrah, but because they regarded not his preaching, God visited them the second time and burnt them all up with brimstone, saving Lot. Moses came first a visitation into Egypt with God's word, and because they would not hear him, God visited them again and drowned them in the Red Sea. God likewise with his first visitation visited the Israelites by his prophets, but because they would not hear his prophets, he visited them the second time and dispersed them in Assyria and Babylon.

John Baptist likewise and our Savior Christ visited them afterwards, declaring to them God's will; and because they despised these visitors, he destroyed Jerusalem by Titus and Vespasianus.

Germany was visited twenty years with God's word, but they did not earnestly embrace it, and in life follow it, but made a mingle mangle and hotchpotch of it, I cannot tell what, partly popery, partly true religion mingled together. They say in my country, when they call their hogs to the swine trough: "Come to thy mingle mangle, come pyr, come pyr;" even so they made mingle mangle of it.

They could clatter and prate of the Gospel, but when all cometh to all, they joined popery so with it that they marred all together; they scratched and scraped all the livings of the church, and under a color of religion turned it to their own proper gain and lucre. God seeing that they would not come unto his word, now he visiteth them in the second time of his

visitation with his wrath. For the taking away of God's word is a manifest token of his wrath. We have now a first visitation in England; let us beware of the second. We have the ministration of his word, we are yet well, but the house is not clean swept yet.

God has sent us a noble King in this his visitation. Let us not provoke him against us, let us beware, let us not displease him, let us not be unthankful and unkind, let us beware of bywalking and contemning God's word, let us pray diligently for our king, let us receive with all obedience and prayer the word of God. A word or two more and I commit you to God, I will monish you of a thing. I hear say ye walk inordinately, ye talk unseemly other ways than it becometh Christian subjects. Ye take upon you to judge the judgments of judges. I will not make the king a Pope, for the Pope will have all things that he doth taken for an Article of our faith. I will not say but that the king and his council may err, the Parliament houses, both the high and low, may err. I pray daily that they may not err. It becometh us whatsoever they decree to stand unto it, and receive it obediently, as far forth as it is not manifestly wicked, and directly against the word of God; it pertaineth unto us to think the best, though we cannot tender a cause for the doing of everything. For *caritas omnia credit, omnia sperat*, charity doth believe and trust all things. We ought to expound to the best all things, although we cannot yield a reason.

Therefore I exhort you good people pronounce in good part all the facts and deeds of the magistrates and judges. Charity judgeth the best of all men, and specially of magistrates. St. Paul saith *nolite judicare ante tempus donec dominus advenerit*, judge not before the time of the Lord's coming. *Pravum cor hominis*, man's heart is unsearchable, it is a ragged piece of work, no man knoweth his own heart, and therefore David prayeth and saith *ab occultis meis munda me*, deliver me from my unknown faults. I am a further offender than I can see. A man shall be blinded in love of himself and not see so much in himself as in other men, let us not therefore judge judges. We are comptible to God, and so be they. Let them alone, they have their counts to make. If we have charity in us, we shall do this. For *caritas operatur*, charity worketh. What worketh it? marry *omnia credere, omnia sperare*, to accept all things in good part. *Nolite judicare ante tempus*, judge not before the Lord's coming. In this we learn

to know Antichrist, which doth elevate himself in the Church, and judgeth at his pleasure before the time. His canonizations and judging of men before the Lord's judgment be a manifest token of Antichrist. How can he know saints? He knoweth not his own heart, and he cannot know them by miracles. For some miracle workers shall go to the devil. I will tell you what I remember yesternight in my bed. A marvelous tale to perceive how inscrutable a man's heart is. I was once at Oxford (for I had occasion to come that way when I was in my office); they told me it was a gainer way, and a fairer way, and by that occasion I lay there a night. Being there I heard of an execution that was done upon one that suffered for treason. It was (as ye know) a dangerous world, for it might soon cost a man his life for a word's speaking. I cannot tell what the matter was, but the judge set it so out that the man was condemned. The twelve men came in and said guilty, and upon that he was judged to be hanged, drawn, and quartered. When the rope was about his neck, no man could persuade him that he was in any fault, and stood there a great while in the protestation of his innocency. They hanged him, and cut him down somewhat too soon before he was clean dead, then they drew him to the fire, and he revived, and then he, coming to his remembrance, confessed his fault, and said he was guilty. Oh, a wonderful example! It may well be said, *pravum cor hominis et inscrutabile*, a crabbed piece of work and unsearchable. I will leave here, for I think you know what I mean well enough.

THE SERMON OF THE PLOW

"All things which are written are written for our erudition and knowledge." All things that are written in God's book, in the Bible book, in the book of the Holy Scriptures, are written to be our doctrine. I told you in my first sermon, honorable audience, that I proposed to declare unto you two things. The one, what seed should be sown in God's field, in God's plow-land; and the other, who should be the sowers.

That is to say, what doctrine is to be taught in Christ's Church and congregation, and what men should be the teachers and preachers of it. The first part I have told you in the three sermons past, in which I have essayed to set forth my plow, to

prove what I could do. And now I shall tell you who be the ploughers; for God's word is a seed to be sown in God's field — that is, the faithful congregation — and the preacher is the sower. And it is in the Gospel: "He that soweth,— the husbandman, the plowman,— went forth to sow his seed." So that a preacher is resembled to a plowman, as it is in another place: "No man that putteth his hand to the plow and looketh back is apt for the kingdom of God." That is to say, let no preacher be negligent in doing his office. . . .

For preaching of the Gospel is one of God's plow-works, and the preacher is one of God's plowmen. Ye may not be offended with my similitude, in that I compare preaching to the labor and work of plowing, and the preacher to a plowman. Ye may not be offended with this my similitude, for I have been slandered of some persons for such things. But as preachers must be wary and circumspect, that they give not any just occasion to be slandered and ill-spoken of by the hearers, so must not the auditors be offended without cause. For heaven is in the Gospel likened to a mustard seed; it is compared also to a piece of leaven; and as Christ saith that at the last day he will come like a thief; and what dishonor is this to God? Or what derogation is this to heaven? Ye may not, then, I say, be offended with my similitude for because I liken preaching to a plowman's labor, and a prelate to a plowman. But now you will ask me whom I call a prelate. A prelate is that man, whatever he be, that hath a flock to be taught of him; whosoever hath any spiritual charge in the faithful congregation, and whosoever he be that hath cure of souls. And well may the preacher and the plowman be likened together: First, for their labor at all seasons of the year; for there is no time of the year in which the plowman hath not some special work to do, as in my country, in Leicestershire, the plowman hath a time to set forth, and to assay his plow, and other times for other necessary works to be done. And then they also may be likened together for the diversity of works and variety of offices that they have to do. For as the plowman first setteth forth his plow, and then tilleth his land, and breaketh it in furrows, and sometimes ridgeth it up again; and at another time harroweth it and clotteth it, and sometimes dungeth it and hedgeth it, diggeth it and weedeth it, purgeth it and maketh it clean; so the prelate, the preacher, hath many diverse offices to do. He hath first a busy work to bring his parishioners to a

right faith, as Paul calleth it; and not a swerving faith, but to a faith that embraceth Christ, and trusteth to his merits; a lively faith; a justifying faith; a faith that maketh a man righteous without respect of works; as ye have it very well declared and set forth in the homily. He hath then a busy work, I say, to bring his flock to a right faith, and then to confirm them in the same faith — now casting them down with the law, and with threatenings of God for sin; now ridging them up again with the Gospel, and with the promises of God's favor; now weeding them, by telling them their faults, and making them forsake sin; now clotting them, by breaking their stony hearts, and by making them supple-hearted, and making them to have hearts of flesh — that is, soft hearts, and apt for doctrine to enter in; now teaching to know God rightly, and to know their duty to God and their neighbors; now exhorting them when they know their duty, that they do it, and be diligent in it; so that they have a continual work to do. Great is their business, and, therefore, great should be their hire. They have great labors, and, therefore, they ought to have good livings, that they may commodiously feed their flock, for the preaching of the Word of God unto the people is called meat. Scripture calleth it meat, not strawberries, that come but once a year, and tarry not long, but are soon gone; but it is meat; it is no dainties. The people must have meat that must be familiar and continual, and daily given unto them to feed upon. Many make a strawberry of it, ministering it but once a year; but such do not the office of good prelates. For Christ saith: "Who think you is a wise and faithful servant? He that giveth meat in due time." So that he must at all times convenient preach diligently; therefore saith he: "Who trow ye is a faithful servant?" He speaketh it as though it were a rare thing to find such a one, and as though he should say there be but few of them to find in the world. And how few of them there be throughout this world that give meat to their flock as they should do, the visitors can best tell. Too few, too few, the more is the pity, and never so few as now.

By this, then, it appeareth that a prelate, or any that hath cure of souls, must diligently and substantially work and labor. Therefore saith Paul to Timothy: "He that desireth to have the office of a bishop, or a prelate, that man desireth a good work." Then if it be a good work, it is work; ye can but make a work of it. It is God's work, God's plow, and that plow God would

have still going. Such, then, as loiter and live idly are not good prelates or ministers. And of such as do not preach and teach and do their duties, God saith by his prophet Jeremy: "Cursed be the man that doeth the work of God fraudulently, guilefully, or deceitfully"; some books have it *negligenter*, "negligently," or "slackly." How many such prelates, how many such bishops, Lord, for thy mercy! are there now in England? And what shall we in this case do? Shall we company with them? O Lord, for thy mercy! shall we not company with them? O Lord, whither shall we flee from them? But "cursed be he that doth the work of God negligently or guilefully." A sore word for them that are negligent in discharging their office or have done it fraudulently; for there is the thing that maketh the people ill. . . .

But now for the fault of unpreaching prelates, methink I could guess what might be said for excusing of them. They are so troubled with lordly living, they be so placed in palaces, couched in courts, ruffling in their rents, dancing in their dominions, burdened with ambassages, pampering of their paunches, like a monk that maketh his jubilee; munching in their mangers, and moiling in their gay manors and mansions, and so troubled with loitering in their lordships, that they cannot attend it. They are otherwise occupied, some in the king's matters, some are embassadors, some of the privy council, some to furnish the court, some are lords of the Parliament, some are presidents, and some comptrollers of mints.

Well, well, is this their duty? Is this their office? Is this their calling? Should we have ministers of the Church to be comptrollers of the mints? Is this a meet office for a priest that hath cure of souls? Is this his charge? I would here ask one question: I would fain know who controlleth the devil at home in his parish, while he controlleth the mint? If the apostles might not leave the office of preaching to the deacons, shall one leave it for minting? I cannot tell you; but the saying is, that since priests have been minters money has been worse than it was before. And they say that the evilness of money hath made all things dearer, and in this behalf I must speak to England. "Hear, my country, England," as Paul saith in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, the sixth chapter; for Paul was no sitting bishop, but a walking and preaching bishop. But when he went from them, he left there behind him the plow going still; for he

wrote unto them and rebuked them for going to law and pleading their cases before heathen judges. "Is there," saith he, "utterly among you no wise man to be an arbitrator in matters of judgment? What, not one of all that can judge between brother and brother; but one brother goeth to law with another, and that under heathen judges? Appoint them judges that are most abject and vile in the congregation." Which he speaketh in rebuking them; "for," saith he, "I speak it to your shame." So, England, I speak it to thy shame. Is there never a nobleman to be a lord president, but it must be a prelate? Is there never a wise man in the realm to be a comptroller of the mint? I speak it to your shame. If there be never a wise man, make a water-bearer, a tinker, a cobbler, a slave, a page, comptroller of the mint; make a mean gentleman, a groom, a yeoman, or a poor beggar, lord president!

Thus I speak, not that I would have it so; but to your shame, if there be never a gentleman meet nor able to be lord president. For why are not the noblemen and young gentlemen of England so brought up in knowledge of God and in learning that they may be able to execute offices in the commonweal? The king hath a great many of wards, and I trow there is a court of wards; why is there not a school for the wards, as well as there is a court for their lands? Why are they not set in schools where they may learn? Or why are they not sent to the universities, that they may be able to serve the king when they come to age? If the wards and young gentlemen were well brought up in learning, and in the knowledge of God, they would not, when they come to age, so much give themselves to other vanities. And if the nobility be well trained in godly learning, the people would follow the same train. For, truly, such as the noblemen be, such will the people be. And, now, the only cause why noblemen be not made lord presidents is because they have not been brought up in the learning. Therefore for the love of God appoint teachers and schoolmasters! . . .

And now I would ask a strange question: Who is the most diligent bishop and prelate in all England that passeth all the rest in doing his office? I can tell, for I know him who it is; I know him well. But now I think I see you listening and hearkening that I should name him. There is one that passeth all the others, and is the most diligent prelate and preacher in all England. And will ye know who it is? I will tell you; it is

the devil. He is the most diligent preacher of all others; he is never out of his diocese; he is never from his cure; ye shall never find him unoccupied; he is ever in his parish; he keepeth residence at all times; ye shall never find him out of the way; call for him when you will, he is ever at home; the diligentest preacher in all the realm; he is ever at his plow; no lording nor loitering can hinder him; he is ever applying his business; ye shall never find him idle, I warrant you!

ON THE PICKINGS OF OFFICEHOLDERS

But now I will play St. Paul, and translate the thing on myself. I will become the king's officer for awhile. I have to lay out for the king twenty thousand pounds, or a great sum whatsoever it be; well, when I have laid it out, and do bring in mine account, I must give three hundred marks to have my bills warranted. If I have done truly and uprightly, what should need me to give a penny to have my bills warranted? If I have done my office truly, and do bring in a true account, wherefore should one groat be given? yea, one groat, for warranting of my bills? Smell ye nothing in this? What needeth any bribes-giving, except the bills be false? No man giveth bribes for warranting of his bills, except they be false bills. Well, such practice hath been in England, but beware; it will out one day; beware of God's proverb: "There is nothing hidden that shall not be opened"; yea, even in this world, if ye be not the children of damnation. And here now I speak to you, my masters, minters, augmentationers, receivers, surveyors, and auditors; I make a petition unto you; I beseech you all be good to the king. He hath been good to you, therefore be good to him; yea, be good to your own souls. Ye are known well enough, what ye were afore ye came to your offices, and what lands ye had then, and what ye have purchased since, and what buildings ye make daily. Well, I pray you so build that the king's workmen may be paid. They make their moan that they can get no money. The poor laborers, gun-makers, powder-men, bow-makers, arrow-makers, smiths, carpenters, soldiers, and other crafts, cry out for their duties. They be unpaid, some of them, three or four months; yea, some of them half a year; yea, some of them put up bills this time twelve months for their money, and cannot be paid yet. They cry out for their money, and, as the

prophet saith, *clamor operariorum ascendit ad aures meas*, the cry of the workmen is come up to mine ears. Oh, for God's love, let the workmen be paid, if there be money enough; or else there will whole showers of God's vengeance rain down upon your heads! Therefore, ye minters, and ye augmentationers, serve the king truly. So build and purchase, that the king may have money to pay his workmen. It seemeth ill-favoredly that ye should have enough wherewith to build superfluously, and the king lack to pay his poor laborers. Well, yet I doubt not but that there be some good officers. But I will not swear for all.

I have now preached three Lents. The first time I preached restitution. "Restitution," quoth some, "what should he preach of restitution? Let him preach of contrition," quoth they, "and let restitution alone; we can never make restitution." Then, say I, if thou wilt not make restitution, thou shalt go to the devil for it. Now choose thee either restitution, or else endless damnation. But now there be two manner of restitutions; secret restitution, and open restitution; whether of both it be, so that restitution be made, it is all good enough. At my first preaching of restitution, one good man took remorse of conscience, and acknowledged himself to me, that he had deceived the king; and willing he was to make restitution; and so the first Lent came to my hands twenty pounds to be restored to the king's use. I was promised twenty pounds more the same Lent, but it could not be made, so that it came not. Well, the next Lent came three hundred and twenty pounds more. I received it myself, and paid it to the king's council. So I was asked what he was that made this restitution? But should I have named him? Nay,—they should as soon have slit this wesant of mine! Well, now, this Lent came one hundred and fourscore pounds, ten shillings, which I have paid and delivered this present day to the king's council: and so this man hath made a godly restitution. "And so," quoth I to a certain nobleman that is one of the king's council, "if every man that hath beguiled the king should make restitution after this sort, it would cough the king twenty thousand pounds, I think," quoth I. "Yea, that it would," quoth the other, "a whole hundred thousand pounds." Alack, alack; make restitution; for God's sake make restitution; ye will cough in hell else, that all the devils there will laugh at your coughing. There is no remedy, but restitution open or secret; or else hell.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER

(1841–)

IR WILFRID LAURIER, Premier of Canada, is perhaps the most notable orator the Dominion has produced. The Toronto Globe said when he entered the Canadian House of Commons that he "produced a sensation, not more by the finished grace of his oratory than by the boldness and authority with which he handled the deepest political problems." In politics, he has described himself as a "Liberal of the English school, a pupil of Charles James Fox, Daniel O'Connell, and greatest of them all — William Ewart Gladstone!" His admiration for Gladstone inspired the well-known oration of May 26th, 1898, in the Canadian House of Commons — one of the best of all the recorded characterizations of Gladstone.

Born November 20th, 1841, at St. Lin, he was educated at L'Assomption College and at the Law School of McGill University. He was called to the bar in 1864, and after practicing for several years went to L'Avenir for his health, editing while there a reform newspaper, Le Defricheur, and identifying himself with the "advanced Liberals" of that period. Recovering his health, he resumed the practice of the law, settling at St. Cristophe, now Arthabaskaville. In 1871 he entered public life as a member of the Quebec Assembly, and in 1874 was elected to the Canadian House of Commons. Under the McKenzie administration in 1876, he became Minister of Internal Revenue, and when the Liberals were forced into opposition, where they remained eighteen years, he became one of their acknowledged leaders. When they regained power in 1896, he became Premier, and in 1899 attracted international attention by the vigor of his speech on the Alaska boundary treaty. When he visited England to be present at the Queen's Diamond Jubilee, his reception is described as "almost regal." He was made a knight of the Grand Cross of St. Michael and St. George, received degrees from Oxford and Cambridge, and was voted a gold medal by the Cobden Club. On visiting France he was made a grand officer of the Legion of Honor, and in Italy the Pope showed him special honor. A volume of his speeches was published in 1890.

THE CHARACTER AND WORK OF GLADSTONE

(Delivered in the Canadian House of Commons, May 26th, 1898)

Mr. Speaker:—

EVERYBODY in this House will, I think, agree that it is eminently fitting and proper that in the universal expression of regret which ascends towards heaven from all parts of the civilized world we also should join our voice and testify to the very high sense and respect, admiration, and veneration which the entire people of Canada, irrespective of creed, or race, or party, entertain for the memory of the great man who has just closed his earthly career.

England has lost the most illustrious of her sons; but the loss is not England's alone, nor is it confined to the great empire which acknowledges England's suzerainty, nor even to the proud race which can claim kinship with the people of England. The loss is the loss of mankind. Mr. Gladstone gave his whole life to his country; but the work which he did for his country was conceived and carried out on principles of such high elevation, for purposes so noble and aims so lofty, that not his country alone, but the whole of mankind, benefited by his work. It is no exaggeration to say that he has raised the standard of civilization, and the world to-day is undoubtedly better for both the precept and the example of his life. His death is mourned, not only by England, the land of his birth, not only by Scotland, the land of his ancestors, not only by Ireland, for whom he did so much, and attempted to do so much more; but also by the people of the two Sicilies, for whose outraged rights he once aroused the conscience of Europe; by the people of the Ionian Islands, whose independence he secured; by the people of Bulgaria and the Danubian provinces, in whose cause he enlisted the sympathy of his own native country. Indeed, since the days of Napoleon, no man has lived whose name has traveled so far and so wide over the surface of the earth; no man has lived whose name alone so deeply moved the hearts of so many millions of men. Whereas, Napoleon impressed his tremendous personality upon peoples far and near by the strange fascination which the genius of war has always exercised over the imagination of men in all lands and in all ages, the name of Gladstone had come to

be, in the minds of all civilized nations, the living incarnation of right against might — the champion, the dauntless, tireless champion, of the oppressed against the oppressor. It is, I believe, equally true to say that he was the most marvelous mental organization which the world has seen since Napoleon — certainly the most compact, the most active, and the most universal.

This last half century in which we live has produced many able and strong men, who, in different walks of life, have attracted the attention of the world at large; but of the men who have illustrated this age, it seems to me that in the eyes of posterity four will outlive and outshine all others — Cavour, Lincoln, Bismarck, and Gladstone. If we look simply at the magnitude of the results obtained, compared with the exiguity of the resources at command — if we remember that out of the small kingdom of Sardinia grew United Italy, we must come to the conclusion that Count Cavour was undoubtedly a statesman of marvelous skill and prescience. Abraham Lincoln, unknown to fame when he was elected to the presidency, exhibited a power for the government of men which has scarcely been surpassed in any age. He saved the American Union, he enfranchised the black race, and for the task he had to perform he was endowed in some respects almost miraculously. No man ever displayed a greater insight into the motives, the complex motives, which shape the public opinion of a free country, and he possessed almost to the degree of an instinct the supreme quality in a statesman of taking the right decision, taking it at the right moment, and expressing it in language of incomparable felicity. Prince Bismarck was the embodiment of resolute common sense, unflinching determination, relentless strength, moving onward to his end, and crushing everything in his way as unconcerned as fate itself. Mr. Gladstone undoubtedly excelled every one of these men. He had in his person a combination of varied powers of the human intellect rarely to be found in one single individual. He had the imaginative fancy, the poetic conception of things, in which Count Cavour was deficient. He had the aptitude for business, the financial ability which Lincoln never exhibited. He had the lofty impulses, the generous inspirations which Prince Bismarck always discarded, even if he did not treat them with scorn. He was at once an orator, a statesman, a poet, and a man of business. As an orator he stands certainly in the very front rank of orators of his country or any country, of his age or any age. I remember when

Louis Blanc was in England, in the days of the Second Empire, he used to write to the press of Paris, and in one of his letters to Le Temps he stated that Mr. Gladstone would undoubtedly have been the foremost orator of England if it were not for the existence of Mr. Bright. It may be admitted, and I think it is admitted generally, that on some occasions Mr. Bright reached heights of grandeur and pathos which even Mr. Gladstone did not attain. But Mr. Gladstone had an ability, a vigor, a fluency which no man in his age, or any age, ever rivaled, or even approached. That is not all. To his marvelous mental powers he added no less marvelous physical gifts. He had the eye of a god; the voice of a silver bell; and the very fire of his eye, the very music of his voice, swept the hearts of men even before they had been dazzled by the torrents of his eloquence.

As a statesman, it was the good fortune of Mr. Gladstone that his career was not associated with war. The reforms which he effected, the triumphs which he achieved, were not won by the supreme arbitrament of the sword. The reforms which he effected and the triumphs which he achieved were the result of his power of persuasion over his fellow-men. The reforms which he achieved in many ways amounted to a revolution. They changed, in many particulars, the face of the realm. After Sir Robert Peel had adopted the great principle which eventually carried England from protection to free trade, it was Mr. Gladstone who created the financial system which has been admitted ever since by all students of finance as the secret of Great Britain's commercial success. He enforced the extension of the suffrage to the masses of the nation, and practically thereby made the Government of monarchial England as democratic as that of any republic. He disestablished the Irish Church; he introduced reform into the land tenure, and brought hope into the breasts of those tillers of the soil in Ireland who had for so many generations labored in despair. And all this he did, not by force or violence, but simply by the power of his eloquence and the strength of his personality.

Great, however, as were the acts of the man, after all he was of the human flesh, and for him, as for everybody else, there were trivial and low duties to be performed. It is no exaggeration to say that even in those low and trivial duties he was great. He ennobled the common realities of life. His was above all things a religious mind,—essentially religious in the highest

sense of the term. And the religious sentiment which dominated his public life and his speeches, that same sentiment, according to the testimony of those who knew him best, also permeated all his actions, from the highest to the humblest. He was a man of strong and pure affections of long and lasting friendship, and to describe the beauty of his domestic life no words of praise can be adequate. It was simply ideally beautiful, and in the latter years of his life as touching as it was beautiful. May I be permitted, without any impropriety, to recall that it was my privilege to experience and to appreciate that courtesy, made up of dignity and grace, which was famous all over the world, but of which no one could have an appropriate opinion unless he had been the recipient of it? In a character so complex and diversified, one may be asked what was the dominant feature, what was the supreme quality, the one characteristic which marked the nature of the man. Was it his incomparable genius for finance? Was it his splendid oratorical powers? Was it his marvelous fecundity of mind? In my estimation, it was not any one of those qualities. Great as they were, there was one still more marked, and if I have to give my own impression, I would say that the one trait which was dominant in his nature, which marked the man more distinctly than any other, was his intense humanity, his paramount sense of right, his abhorrence of injustice, wrong, and oppression wherever to be found or in whatever shape they might show themselves. Injustice, wrong, oppression, acted upon him, as it were, mechanically, and aroused every fibre of his being, and from that moment, to the repairing of the injustice, the undoing of the wrong, and the destruction of the oppression, he gave his mind, his heart, his soul, his whole life, with an energy, with an intensity, with a vigor paralleled in no man unless it be the First Napoleon. There are many evidences of this in his life. When he was traveling in southern Italy, as a tourist, for pleasure and for the benefit of the health of his family, he became aware of the abominable system which was there prevailing under the name of constitutional government. He left everything aside, even the object which had brought him to Italy, and applied himself to investigate and to collect evidence, and then denounced the abominable system in a trumpet blast of such power that it shook to its very foundation the throne of King Ferdinand and sent it tottering to its fall. Again, when he was sent as High Commissioner to the Ionian Islands,

the injustice of keeping this Hellenic population separated from the rest of Greece, separated from the kingdom to which they were adjacent and towards which all their aspirations were raised, struck his generous soul with such force that he became practically their advocate and secured their independence. Again, when he had withdrawn from public life, and when, in the language of Thiers, under somewhat similar circumstances, he had returned to "*ses chères études*," the atrocities perpetrated by the Turks on the people of Roumania brought him back to public life with a vehemence, an impetuosity, and a torrent of fierce indignation that swept everything before it. If this be, as I think it is, the one distinctive feature of his character, it seems to explain away what are called the inconsistencies of his life. "Inconsistencies,"—there were none in his life. He had been brought up in the most unbending school of Toryism. He became the most active Reformer of our own times. But whilst he became the leader of the Liberal party and an active Reformer, it is only due to him to say that in his complex mind there was a vast space for what is known as conservatism. His mind was not only liberal, but conservative as well, and he clung to the affections of his youth until, in questions of practical moment, he found them clashing with that sense of right and abhorrence of injustice of which I have spoken. But the moment he found his conservative affections clash with what he thought right and just, he did not hesitate to abandon his former convictions and go the whole length of the reforms demanded. Thus he was always devoutly, filially, lovingly attached to the Church of England. He loved it, as he often declared. He had adhered to it as an establishment in England, but the very reasons and arguments which, in his mind, justified the establishment of the church in England compelled him to a different course, as far as that church was concerned in Ireland. In England the church was the church of the majority, of almost the unanimity of the nation. In Ireland it was the church of the minority, and therefore he did not hesitate. His course was clear; he removed the one church and maintained the other. So it was with Home Rule, but coming to the subject of Home Rule, though there may be much to say, perhaps this is neither the occasion nor the place to say it. The Irish problem is dormant, but not solved, but the policy proposed by Mr. Gladstone for the solution of this question has provoked too much bitterness, too deep division,

even on the floor of this House, to make it advisable to say anything about it on this occasion.

I notice it, however, simply because it is the last and everlasting monument of that high sense of justice which, above all things, characterized him. When he became convinced that Home Rule was the only method whereby the insoluble problem could be solved, whereby the long open wound could be healed, he did not hesitate one moment, even though he were to sacrifice friends, power, popularity. And he sacrificed friends, power, popularity, in order to give that supreme measure of justice to a long-suffering people. Whatever may be the views which men entertain upon the policy of Home Rule, whether they favor that policy or whether they oppose it; whether they believe in it or whether they do not believe in it, every man, whether friend or foe of that measure, must say that it was not only a bold, but it was a noble thought,— that of attempting to cure discontent in Ireland by trusting to Irish honor and Irish generosity.

Now, sir, he is no more. England is to-day in tears; but fortunate is the nation which has produced such a man! His years are over, but his work is not closed; his work is still going on. The example which he gave to the world shall live forever, and the seed which he has sown with such a copious hand shall still germinate and bear fruit under the full light of heaven.

CANADA, ENGLAND, AND THE UNITED STATES IN 1899

(Delivered in Response to the Toast, 'Canada,' at a Banquet in Chicago, October 9th, 1899, the Anniversary of the Chicago Fire)

Mr. Toastmaster, Mr. President, and Gentlemen:—

I VERY fully and very cordially appreciate the very kind feelings which have just now been uttered by the toastmaster in terms so eloquent, and which you gentlemen have accepted and received in so sympathetic a manner. Let me say at once, in the name of my fellow-Canadians who are here with me, and also, I may say, in the name of the Canadian people, that these feelings we will at all times reciprocate; reciprocate, not only in words evanescent, but in actual living deeds.

I take it to be an evidence of the good relation which, in your estimation, gentlemen, ought to prevail between two such

countries as the United States and Canada, that you have notified us, your next-door neighbors, in this day of rejoicing, to take our share with you of your joy. We shall bring back to our own country the most pleasant remembrance of the day.

We have seen many things here to-day very much to be admired; the imposing ceremonies of the morning, the fine pageant, the grand procession, the orderly and good-natured crowds — all these are things to be admired and, to some extent, to be wondered at. But the one thing of all most to be admired, most to be remembered, is the very inspiration of this festival.

It is quite characteristic of the city of Chicago. As a rule, nations and cities celebrate the day of their foundation or some great victory or some national triumph; in all cases, some event which, when it occurred, was a cause of universal joy and rejoicing. Not so, however, of the city of Chicago. In this, as in everything else, she does not tread in beaten paths; the day which she celebrates is not the day of her foundation, when hunters and fur-traders unconsciously laid down the beginnings of what were to develop into a gigantic city; neither does she celebrate some great action in which American history abounds; nor even does she commemorate a deed selected from the life of some of the great men whom the State has given to the nation, though Illinois can claim the proud privilege of having given to the nation one as great as Washington himself.

The day which she celebrates is the day of her direst calamity, the day when she was swept out of existence by fire. This, I say, is very characteristic of Chicago, because if history recalls her destruction, it also recalls her resurrection. It recalls the energy, the courage, the faith, the enthusiasm with which her citizens met and faced and conquered an appalling calamity.

For my part, well do I remember the awful day, for, as you well know, its horrors were reverberated far beyond the limits of your country, but of all the things which — I was then a young man — I most remember, of all the acts of courage and heroism which were brought forward by the occasion, the one thing which at the same time struck me the most was the appeal issued by the business men of Chicago on the smoking ruins of their city. They appealed to their fellow-citizens. They appealed not for alms, not for charity of any kind, but in most noble language they appealed to their fellow-citizens, especially to those who had business connections in Chicago and whose enter-

prise and energy had conferred honor on the American name, to sustain them in their business in that hour of their trial.

Mark the language. The only thing that they asked was to be sustained in their business, and if sustained in their business they were ready to face and meet the awful calamity which had befallen their city. Well, sir, in my estimation, in my judgment, at least, that was courage of the very highest order. Whenever you meet courage, you are sure to meet justice and generosity. Courage, justice, and generosity always go together, and therefore it is with some degree of satisfaction that I approach the toast to which I have been called to respond.

Because I must say that I feel that though the relations between Canada and the United States are good, though they are brotherly, though they are satisfactory, in my judgment they are not as good, as brotherly, as satisfactory as they ought to be. We are of the same stock. We spring from the same races on one side of the line as on the other. We speak the same language. We have the same literature, and for more than a thousand years we have had a common history.

Let me recall to you the lines which, in the darkest days of the Civil War, the Puritan poet of America issued to England:—

> "Oh, Englishmen! Oh, Englishmen!
> In hope and creed,
> In blood and tongue, are brothers,
> We all are heirs of Runnymede."

Brothers we are, in the language of your own poet. May I not say that while our relations are not always as brotherly as they should have been, may I not ask, Mr. President, on the part of Canada and on the part of the United States, if we are sometimes too prone to stand by the full conceptions of our rights, and exact all our rights to the last pound of flesh? May I not ask if there have not been too often between us petty quarrels, which happily do not wound the heart of the nation?

Sir, I am proud to say in the presence of the Chief Executive of the United States that it is the belief of the Canadian Government that we should make a supreme effort to better our relations and make the government of President McKinley and the present government of Canada, with the assent of Great Britain, so to work together as to remove all causes of dissension between us. And whether the commission which sat first in the

old city of Quebec and sat next in the city of Washington — but whether sitting in Quebec or sitting in Washington, I am sorry to say the result has not been commensurate with our expectations.

Shall I speak my mind? [Cries of "Yes!"] We met a stumbling-block in the question of the Alaskan frontier. Well, let me say here and now the commission could not settle that question, and referred it to their particular Governments, and they are now dealing with it. May I be permitted to say here and now that we do not desire one inch of your land?

But if I state, however, that we want to hold our land, will that be an American sentiment, I want to know? However, though that would not be an American sentiment, though it would not be a British or Canadian sentiment, I am here to say above all, my fellow-countrymen, that we want not to stand upon the extreme limits of our rights. We are ready to give and to take. We can afford to be just; we can afford to be generous because we are strong. We have a population of seventy-seven millions — I beg pardon, I am mistaken, it is the reverse of that. But pardon my mistake, although it is the reverse, I am sure the sentiment is the same.

But though we have many little bickerings of that kind, I speak my whole mind, and I believe I speak the mind of all you gentlemen, when I say that, after all, when we go down to the bottom of our hearts we will find that there is between us a true, genuine affection. There are no two nations to-day on the face of the globe so united as Great Britain and the United States of America.

The Secretary of State told us some few months ago that there was no treaty of alliance between Great Britain and the United States of America. It is very true, there is between the United States of America and Great Britain to-day no treaty of alliance which the pen can write and which the pen can unmake, but there is between Great Britain and the United States of America a unity of blood, of blood which is thicker than water, and I appeal to recent history when I say that whenever one nation has to face an emergency, — a greater emergency than usual, — forthwith the sympathies of the other nation go to her sister.

When last year you were suddenly engaged in war with Spain, though Spain was the weaker party and though it is natural that men should side with the weaker party, our sympathies

went to you for no other reason than that of blood. And I am sure you will agree with me that, though our relations have not reached the degree of perfection to which I would aspire, from that day a new page has been turned in the history of our country. It was no unusual occurrence before the month of May 1898 to read in the British press of American arrogance; neither was it an unusual occurrence to read in the American press of British brutality. Since the month of May 1898, these expressions have disappeared from the vocabulary. You do not hear to-day of American arrogance; neither do you hear of British brutality; but the only expressions which you find in the press of either country now are words of mutual respect and mutual affection.

Sir, an incident took place in the month of June last which showed to me at all events conclusively that there is between us a very deep and sincere affection. I may be pardoned if I recall that instance, because I have to speak of myself.

In the month of June last I spoke on the floor of the House of Commons of Canada on the question of Alaska, and I enunciated the very obvious truism that international problems can be settled in one or two ways only, either by arbitration or by war. And although I proceeded to say immediately that war between Great Britain and the United States would be criminal and would not be thought of for a moment, still the very word «war» created quite an excitement in this country. For that causeless excitement, though I was indirectly the cause of it, I do not at this moment find any fault, because it convinced me to an absolute certainty that between your country and my country the relations have reached that degree of dignity and respect and affection that even the word «war» is never to be mentioned in a British assembly or in an American assembly. The word is not to be pronounced, not even to be predicated. It is not to be pronounced at all. The very idea is abhorrent to us.

I repeat what I then stated, that war between Great Britain and the United States would be criminal — in my estimation and judgment, just as criminal as the Civil War which desolated your country some thirty years ago. Whatever may have been the mistaken views of the civilized world at the time, the civilized world has come to the unanimous conclusion that the War of the Rebellion was a crime. The civilized world has come to the conclusion that it was a benefit to mankind that this Rebellion did

not succeed and that the Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, did not perish from the earth.

Your country was desolated for four long years by the awful scourge of civil war. If there is anything of the many things which are to be admitted in this great country of yours, the one thing for my part which I most admire is the absolute success with which you have re-established the Union and erased all traces of the Civil War. You have done it. What is the reason? There is, I may say, as has been uttered by the President of the United States — I took down his words: "No responsibility which has ever resulted from war is tainted with dishonor. We have succeeded in establishing the cause of the Union because no blood was shed to re-establish the Union except the blood which was shed by the sword; not one drop of blood was ever shed except by the power of the law, and what is the consequence?"

You had it, in consequence, in the war with Spain, when the men of the blue and the men of the gray, the men who had fought for the Confederacy, and the men that fought for the Union, at the call of their country, came back to fight the battles of their own country under a united flag. That was the reason.

My friend, Mr. Cullom, said a moment ago that he might believe me almost an American. I am a British subject, but to this extent, I may say, that as every American, a lover of liberty, a believer in democratic institutions, I rejoiced as any of you did at the spectacle which was presented at Santiago, El Caney, and elsewhere during that war.

Sirs, there was another civil war. There was a civil war in the last century. There was a civil war between England, then, and her colonies. The union which then existed between England and her colonies was severed. If it was severed, American citizens, as you know it was, through no fault of your fathers, the fault was altogether the fault of the British Government of that day. If the British Government of that day had treated the American colonies as the British Government for the last twenty or fifty years has treated its colonies; if Great Britain had given you then the same degree of liberty which it gives to Canada, my country; if it had given you, as it has given us, legislative independence absolute, the result would have been different — the course of victory, the course of history, would have been very different.

But what has been done cannot be undone. You cannot expect that the union which was then severed shall ever be restored; but can we not escape — can we not hope that if the union cannot be restored under the law, at least there can be a union of hearts? Can we not hope that the banners of England and the banners of the United States shall never, never again meet in conflict, except those conflicts provided by the arts of peace, such as we see to-day in the harbor of New York in the contest between the Shamrock and the Columbia for the supremacy of naval architecture and naval prowess? Can we not hope that if ever the banners of England and the banners of the United States are again to meet on the battlefield, they shall meet entwined together in the defense of some holy cause, in the defense of holy justice, for the defense of the oppressed, for the enfranchisement of the downtrodden, and for the advancement of liberty, progress, and civilization?

HENRY LEE

(1756–1818)

THE funeral oration for Washington, delivered by "Light-Horse Harry" Lee, at the request of Congress, was so greatly admired by his contemporaries that as one of the classics of American oratory it survives, and is likely to survive, the change from the Ciceronian to the Saxon style. As a rule, however, General Lee was much more successful as a soldier than as an orator. He was born in Westmoreland County, Virginia, January 29th, 1756, and died March 25th, 1818. His services as a general of cavalry in the Revolutionary War were distinguished, but his reputation as a soldier has been obscured by that of his greater son, General Robert E. Lee.

FUNERAL ORATION FOR WASHINGTON

(Delivered at the Request of the Congress of the United States, at Philadelphia, on December 26th, 1799)

IN OBEDIENCE to your will, I rise your humble organ, with the hope of executing a part of the system of public mourning which you have been pleased to adopt, commemorative of the death of the most illustrious and most beloved personage this country has ever produced; and which, while it transmits to posterity your sense of the awful event, faintly represents your knowledge of the consummate excellence you so cordially honor.

Desperate, indeed, is any attempt on earth to meet correspondently this dispensation of heaven; for while with pious resignation we submit to the will of an all-gracious Providence, we can never cease lamenting, in our finite view of Omnipotent wisdom, the heartrending privation for which our nation weeps. When the civilized world shakes to its centre; when every moment gives birth to strange and momentous changes; when our peaceful quarter of the globe, exempt, as it happily has been, from any share in the slaughter of the human race, may yet be compelled to abandon her pacific policy and to risk the doleful casualties of war, what limit is there to the extent of our loss?

None within the reach of my words to express; none which your feelings will not disavow.

The founder of our Federate Republic — our bulwark in war, our guide in peace, is no more! Oh, that this were but questionable! Hope, the comforter of the wretched, would pour into our agonizing hearts its balmy dew. But, alas! there is no hope for us; our Washington is removed forever! Possessing the stoutest frame and purest mind, he had passed nearly to his sixty-eighth year, in the enjoyment of high health, when, habituated by his care of us to neglect himself, a slight cold, disregarded, became inconvenient on Friday, oppressive on Saturday, and, defying every medical interposition before the morning of Sunday, put an end to the best of men. An end did I say? — his fame survives! bounded only by the limits of the earth, and by the extent of the human mind. He survives in our hearts, in the growing knowledge of our children, in the affection of the good throughout the world: and when our monuments shall be done away; when nations now existing shall be no more; when even our young and far-spreading empire shall have perished, still will our Washington's glory unfaded shine, and die not, until love of virtue cease on earth, or earth itself sink into chaos.

How, my fellow-citizens, shall I single to your grateful hearts his pre-eminent worth? Where shall I begin in opening to your view a character throughout sublime? Shall I speak of his warlike achievements, all springing from obedience to his country's will — all directed to his country's good?

Will you go with me to the banks of the Monongahela, to see your youthful Washington, supporting, in the dismal hour of Indian victory, the ill-fated Braddock, and saving, by his judgment and by his valor, the remains of a defeated army, pressed by the conquering savage foe; or when oppressed America, nobly resolving to risk her all in defense of her violated rights, he was elevated by the unanimous voice of Congress to the command of her armies? Will you follow him to the high grounds of Boston, where, to an undisciplined, courageous, and virtuous yeomanry, his presence gave the stability of system, and infused the invincibility of love of country; or shall I carry you to the painful scenes of Long Island, York Island, and New Jersey, when, combating superior and gallant armies, aided by powerful fleets, and led by chiefs high in the roll of fame, he stood, the bulwark of

our safety, undismayed by disaster, unchanged by change of fortune? Or will you view him in the precarious fields of Trenton, where deep gloom, unnerving every arm, reigned triumphant through our thinned, worn down, unaided ranks; himself unmoved? Dreadful was the night. It was about this time of winter; the storm raged; the Delaware, rolling furiously with floating ice, forbade the approach of man. Washington, self-collected, viewed the tremendous scene; his country called; unappalled by surrounding dangers, he passed to the hostile shore; he fought; he conquered. The morning sun cheered the American world. Our country rose on the event; and her dauntless chief, pursuing his blow, completed, in the lawns of Princeton, what his vast soul had conceived on the shores of Delaware.

Thence to the strong grounds of Morristown, he led his small but gallant band; and through an eventful winter, by the high efforts of his genius, whose matchless force was measurable only by the growth of difficulties, he held in check formidable hostile legions, conducted by a chief, experienced in the art of war, and famed for his valor on the ever-memorable heights of Abraham, where fell Wolfe, Montcalm, and since, our much lamented Montgomery, all covered with glory. In this fortunate interval, produced by his masterly conduct, our fathers, ourselves, animated by his resistless example, rallied around our country's standard, and continued to follow her beloved chief through the various and trying scenes to which the destinies of our Union led.

Who is there that has forgotten the vales of Brandywine, the fields of Germantown, or the plains of Monmouth? Everywhere present, wants of every kind obstructing, numerous and valiant armies encountering, himself a host, he assuaged our sufferings, limited our privations, and upheld our tottering Republic. Shall I display to you the spread of the fire of his soul, by rehearsing the praises of the hero of Saratoga, and his much-loved compeer of the Carolinas? No; our Washington wears not borrowed glory. To Gates — to Greene, he gave without reserve the applause due to their eminent merit; and long may the chiefs of Saratoga, and of Eutaw receive the grateful respect of a grateful people.

Moving in his own orbit, he imparted heat and light to his most distant satellites; and combining the physical and moral force of all within his sphere with irresistible weight he took

his course, commiserating folly, disdaining vice, dismaying treason, and invigorating despondency, until the auspicious hour arrived, when, united with the intrepid forces of a potent and magnanimous ally, he brought to submission the since conqueror of India; thus finishing his long career of military glory with a lustre corresponding to his great name, and in this, his last act of war, affixing the seal of fate to our nation's birth.

To the horrid din of battle, sweet peace succeeded; and our virtuous chief, mindful only of the common good in a moment of tempting personal aggrandizement, hushed the discontents of growing sedition, and surrendering his power into the hands from which he had received it, converted his sword into a plowshare, teaching an admiring world that to be truly great you must be truly good.

Were I to stop here, the picture would be incomplete and the task imposed unfinished. Great as was our Washington in war, and as much as did that greatness contribute to produce the American Republic, it is not in war alone his pre-eminence stands conspicuous. His various talents, combining all the capacities of a statesman with those of a soldier, fitted him alike to guide the councils and the armies of our nation. Scarcely had he rested from his martial toils while his invaluable parental advice was still sounding in our ears, when he, who had been our shield and our sword, was called forth to act a less splendid, but more important part.

Possessing a clear and penetrating mind, a strong and sound judgment, calmness and temper for deliberation, with invincible firmness and perseverance in resolutions maturely formed; drawing information from all; acting from himself, with incorruptible integrity and unvarying patriotism; his own superiority and the public confidence alike marked him as the man designed by heaven to lead in the great political as well as military events which have distinguished the era of his life.

The finger of an overruling Providence, pointing at Washington, was neither mistaken nor unobserved, when, to realize the vast hopes to which our Revolution had given birth, a change of political system became indispensable.

How novel, how grand the spectacle! Independent States, stretched over an immense territory, and known only by common difficulty, clinging to their union as the rock of their safety,

deciding by frank comparison of their relative condition to rear on that rock, under the guidance of reason, a common government through whose commanding protection, liberty and order, with their long train of blessings, should be safe to themselves, and the sure inheritance of their posterity.

This arduous task devolved on citizens selected by the people, from knowledge of their wisdom and confidence in their virtue. In this august assembly of sages and of patriots, Washington of course was found; and as if acknowledged to be most wise where all were wise, with one voice he was declared their chief. How well he merited this rare distinction, how faithful were the labors of himself and his compatriots, the work of their hands and our union, strength and prosperity, the fruits of that work, best attest.

But to have essentially aided in presenting to his country this consummation of her hopes, neither satisfied the claims of his fellow-citizens on his talents, nor those duties which the possession of those talents imposed. Heaven had not infused into his mind such an uncommon share of its ethereal spirit to remain unemployed; nor bestowed on him his genius unaccompanied with the corresponding duty of devoting it to the common good. To have framed a constitution was showing only, without realizing, the general happiness. This great work remained to be done; and America, steadfast in her preference, with one voice summoned her beloved Washington, unpracticed as he was in the duties of civil administration, to execute this last act in the completion of the national felicity. Obedient to her call, he assumed the high office with that self-distrust peculiar to his innate modesty, the constant attendant of pre-eminent virtue. What was the burst of joy through our anxious land, on this exhilarating event, is known to us all. The aged, the young, the brave, the fair, rivaled each other in demonstrations of their gratitude; and this high-wrought, delightful scene was heightened in its effect by the singular contest between the zeal of the bestowers and the avoidance of the receiver of the honors bestowed. Commencing his administration, what heart is not charmed with the recollection of the pure and wise principles announced by himself as the basis of his political life! He best understood the indissoluble union between virtue and happiness, between duty and advantage, between the genuine maxims of an honest and

magnanimous policy and the solid rewards of public prosperity and individual felicity; watching, with an equal and comprehensive eye, over this great assemblage of communities and interests, he laid the foundations of our national policy in the unerring, immutable principles of morality, based on religion, exemplifying the pre-eminence of a free government, by all the attributes which win the affections of its citizens, or command the respect of the world.

"O fortunatos nimium, sua si bona norint!"

Leading through the complicated difficulties produced by previous obligations and conflicting interests, seconded by succeeding houses of Congress, enlightened and patriotic, he surmounted all original obstruction, and brightened the path of our national felicity.

The presidential term expiring, his solicitude to exchange exaltation for humility returned with a force increased with increase of age; and he had prepared his Farewell Address to his countrymen, proclaiming his intention, when the united interposition of all around him, enforced by the eventful prospects of the epoch, produced a further sacrifice of inclination to duty. The election of President followed, and Washington, by the unanimous vote of the nation, was called to resume the Chief Magistracy. What a wonderful fixture of confidence! Which attracts most our admiration, a people so correct, or a citizen combining an assemblage of talents forbidding rivalry, and stifling even envy itself? Such a nation ought to be happy, such a chief must be forever revered.

War, long menaced by the Indian tribes, now broke out; and the terrible conflict, deluging Europe with blood, began to shed its baneful influence over our happy land. To the first, outstretching his invincible arm, under the orders of the gallant Wayne, the American Eagle soared triumphant through distant forests. Peace followed victory, and the melioration of the condition of the enemy followed peace. Godlike virtue, which uplifts even the subdued savage!

To the second he opposed himself. New and delicate was the conjuncture, and great was the stake. Soon did his penetrating mind discern and seize the only course, continuing to us all the felicity enjoyed. He issued his proclamation of neutrality. This index to his whole subsequent conduct, was sanctioned by the

approbation of both Houses of Congress, and by the approving voice of the people.

To this sublime policy he inviolably adhered, unmoved by foreign intrusion, unshaken by domestic turbulence.

> "*Justum et tenacem propositi virum,*
> *Non civium ardor prava jubentium,*
> *Non vultus instantis tyranni,*
> *Mente quatit solida.*"

Maintaining his pacific system at the expense of no duty, America, faithful to herself, and unstained in her honor, continued to enjoy the delights of peace, while afflicted Europe mourns in every quarter, under the accumulated miseries of an unexampled war; miseries in which our happy country must have shared, had not our pre-eminent Washington been as firm in council as he was brave in the field.

Pursuing steadfastly his course, he held safe the public happiness, preventing foreign war, and quelling internal discord, till the revolving period of a third election approached, when he executed his interrupted but inextinguishable desire of returning to the humble walks of private life.

The promulgation of his fixed resolution stopped the anxious wishes of an affectionate people from adding a third unanimous testimonial of their unabated confidence in the man so long enthroned in their hearts. When before was affection like this exhibited on earth? Turn over the records of ancient Greece; review the annals of mighty Rome; examine the volumes of modern Europe; you search in vain. America and her Washington only afford the dignified exemplification.

The illustrious personage, called by the national voice in succession to the arduous office of guiding a free people, had new difficulties to encounter. The amicable effort of settling our difficulties with France, begun by Washington, and pursued by his successor in virtue as in station, proving abortive, America took measures of self-defense. No sooner was the public mind roused by a prospect of danger, than every eye was turned to the friend of all, though secluded from public view, and gray in public service. The virtuous veteran, following his plow, received the unexpected summons with mingled emotions of indignation at the unmerited ill treatment of his country, and of a determination once more to risk his all in her defense.

The annunciation of these feelings, in his affecting letter to the President, accepting the command of the army, concludes his official conduct.

First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen, he was second to none in the humble and endearing scenes of private life. Pious, just, humane, temperate, and sincere; uniform, dignified, and commanding, his example was as edifying to all around him as were the effects of that example lasting.

To his equals he was condescending; to his inferiors kind; and to the dear object of his affections exemplarily tender. Correct throughout, vice shuddered in his presence, and virtue always felt his fostering hand; the purity of his private character gave effulgence to his public virtues.

His last scene comported with the whole tenor of his life: although in extreme pain, not a sigh, not a groan escaped him; and with undisturbed serenity he closed his well-spent life. Such was the man America has lost! Such was the man for whom our nation mourns!

Methinks I see his august image, and hear falling from his venerable lips these deep-sinking words:—

"Cease, sons of America, lamenting our separation: go on, and confirm by your wisdom the fruits of our joint counsels, joint efforts, and common dangers. Reverence religion; diffuse knowledge throughout your land; patronize the arts and sciences; let liberty and order be inseparable companions; control party spirit, the bane of free government; observe good faith to, and cultivate peace with all nations; shut up every avenue to foreign influence; contract rather than extend national connexion; rely on yourselves only; be American in thought and deed. Thus will you give immortality to that Union, which was the constant object of my terrestrial labors. Thus will you preserve undisturbed to the latest posterity the felicity of a people to me most dear: and thus will you supply (if my happiness is now aught to you) the only vacancy in the round of pure bliss high heaven bestows."

RICHARD HENRY LEE

(1732–1794)

RICHARD HENRY LEE, author of the Address of 1775 to the people of Great Britain, was born at Stratford, Westmoreland County, Virginia, January 20th, 1732. As a member of the Virginia House of Burgesses, he supported Patrick Henry in the resolutions of 1765, and in 1769 he himself introduced resolutions "denying the right of the mother country to bind the colonies in any case whatever." He was elected to the Continental Congress in 1774, and introduced the Independence resolutions of June 7th, 1776. From 1789 to 1792 he represented Virginia in the United States Senate, dying June 19th, 1794.

ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND

(Read and Adopted in Congress, July 8th, 1775)

[The twelve United Colonies, by their delegates in Congress, to the inhabitants of Great Britain:—]

Friends, Countrymen, and Brethren:—

BY THESE and by every other appellation that may designate the ties which bind us to each other, we entreat your serious attention to this our second attempt to prevent their dissolution. Remembrance of former friendships, pride in the glorious achievements of our common ancestors, and affection for the heirs of their virtues, have hitherto preserved our mutual connection; but when that friendship is violated by the grossest injuries — when the pride of ancestry becomes our reproach, and we are no otherwise allied than as tyrants and slaves — when reduced to the melancholy alternative of renouncing your favor or our freedom, can we hesitate about the choice? Let the spirit of Britons determine.

In a former address we asserted our rights, and stated the injuries we had then received. We hoped that the mention of our

wrongs would have roused that honest indignation which has slept too long for your honor, or the welfare of the empire. But we have not been permitted to entertain this pleasing expectation. Every day brought on accumulation of injuries, and the invention of the ministry has been constantly exercised in adding to the calamities of your American brethren.

After the most valuable right of legislation was infringed; when the powers assumed by your Parliament, in which we are not represented, and from our local and other circumstances cannot be properly represented, rendered our property precarious; after being denied that mode of trial to which we have been long indebted for the safety of our persons and the preservation of our liberties; after being in many instances divested of those laws which were transmitted to us by our common ancestors, and subjected to an arbitrary code, compiled under the auspices of Roman tyrants; after those charters, which encouraged our predecessors to brave death and danger in every shape, on unknown seas, in deserts unexplored, amidst barbarous and inhospitable nations, were annulled; when, without the form of trial, without a public accusation, whole colonies were condemned, their trade destroyed, their inhabitants impoverished; when soldiers were encouraged to imbrue their hands in the blood of Americans, by offers of impunity; when new modes of trial were instituted for the ruin of the accused, where the charge carried with it the horrors of conviction; when a despotic government was established in a neighboring province, and its limits extended to every part of our frontiers; we little imagined that anything could be added to this black catalogue of unprovoked injuries: but we have unhappily been deceived, and the late measures of the British ministry fully convince us that their object is the reduction of these colonies to slavery and ruin.

To confirm this assertion, let us recall your attention to the affairs of America since our last address. Let us combat the calumnies of our enemies, and let us warn you of the dangers that threaten you in our destruction. Many of your fellow-subjects, whose situation deprived them of other support, drew their maintenance from the sea; but the deprivation of our liberty being insufficient to satisfy the resentment of our enemies, the horrors of famine were superadded, and a British Parliament, who, in better times, were the protectors of innocence and the patrons of humanity, have, without distinction of age or sex,

robbed thousands of the food which they were accustomed to draw from that inexhaustible source, placed in their neighborhood by the benevolent Creator.

Another act of your legislature shuts our ports and prohibits our trade with any but those States from whom the great law of self-preservation renders it absolutely necessary we should at present withhold our commerce. But this act (whatever may have been its design) we consider rather as injurious to your opulence than our interest. All our commerce terminates with you; and the wealth we procure from other nations is soon exchanged for your superfluities. Our remittances must then cease with our trade, and our refinements with our affluence. We trust, however, that laws which deprive us of every blessing but a soil that teems with the necessaries of life, and that liberty which renders the enjoyment of them secure, will not relax our vigor in their defense. We might here observe on the cruelty and inconsistency of those, who, while they publicly brand us with reproachful and unworthy epithets, endeavor to deprive us of the means of defense by their interposition with foreign powers, and to deliver us to the lawless ravages of a merciless soldiery. But happily we are not without resources; and though the timid and humiliating applications of a British ministry should prevail with foreign nations, yet industry, prompted by necessity, will not leave us without the necessary supplies.

We could wish to go no further, and, not to wound the ear of humanity, leave untold those rigorous acts of oppression which are daily exercised in the town of Boston, did not we hope that by disclaiming their deeds and punishing the perpetrators, you would shortly vindicate the honor of the British name and reestablish the violated laws of justice.

That once populous, flourishing, and commercial town is now garrisoned by an army, sent not to protect, but to enslave its inhabitants. The civil government is overturned and a military despotism erected upon its ruins. Without law, without right, powers are assumed unknown to the Constitution. Private property is unjustly invaded. The inhabitants, daily subjected to the licentiousness of the soldiery, are forbid to remove, in defiance of their natural rights, in violation of the most solemn compacts. Or, if after long and wearisome solicitation, a pass is procured, their effects are detained, and even those who are most favored have no alternative but poverty or slavery. The distress of

many thousand people, wantonly deprived of the necessaries of life, is a subject on which we would not wish to enlarge.

Yet we cannot but observe that a British fleet (unjustified even by acts of your legislature) are daily employed in ruining our commerce, seizing our ships, and depriving whole communities of their daily bread. Nor will a regard for your honor permit us to be silent, while British troops sully your glory, by actions which the most inveterate enmity will not palliate among civilized nations,—the wanton and unnecessary destruction of Charlestown, a large, ancient, and once populous town, just before deserted by its inhabitants, who had fled to avoid the fury of your soldiery.

If still you retain those sentiments of compassion by which Britons have ever been distinguished; if the humanity which tempered the valor of our common ancestors has not degenerated into cruelty, you will lament the miseries of their descendants.

To what are we to attribute this treatment? If to any secret principle of the Constitution, let it be mentioned; let us learn that the Government we have long revered is not without its defects, and that while it gives freedom to a part, it necessarily enslaves the remainder of the empire. If such a principle exists, why for ages has it ceased to operate? Why at this time is it called into action? Can no reason be assigned for this conduct, or must it be resolved into the wanton exercise of arbitrary power? And shall the descendants of Britons tamely submit to this? No, sirs! We never will; while we revere the memory of our gallant and virtuous ancestors, we never can surrender those glorious privileges for which they fought, bled, and conquered. Admit that your fleets could destroy our towns, and ravage our seacoasts; these are inconsiderable objects, things of no moment to men whose bosoms glow with the ardor of liberty. We can retire beyond the reach of your navy, and, without any sensible diminution of the necessaries of life, enjoy a luxury, which from that period you will want—the luxury of being free.

We know the force of your arms, and was it called forth in the cause of justice and your country, we might dread the exertion; but will Britons fight under the banners of tyranny? Will they counteract the labors, and disgrace the victories of their ancestors? Will they forge chains for their posterity? If they descend to this unworthy task, will their swords retain their edge, their arms their accustomed vigor? Britons can never become the

instruments of oppression, till they lose the spirit of freedom, by which alone they are invincible.

Our enemies charge us with sedition. In what does it consist? In our refusal to submit to unwarrantable acts of injustice and cruelty? If so, show us a period in your history in which you have not been equally seditious. We are accused of aiming at independence; but how is this accusation supported? By the allegations of your ministers — not by our actions. Abused, insulted, and contemned, what steps have we pursued to obtain redress? We have carried our dutiful petitions to the throne. We have applied to your justice for relief. We have retrenched our luxury, and withheld our trade.

The advantages of our commerce were designed as a compensation for your protection. When you ceased to protect, for what were we to compensate?

What has been the success of our endeavors? The clemency of our sovereign is unhappily diverted; our petitions are treated with indignity; our prayers answered by insults. Our application to you remains unnoticed, and leaves us the melancholy apprehension of your wanting either the will or the power to assist us.

Even under these circumstances, what measures have we taken that betray a desire of independence? Have we called in the aid of those foreign powers who are the rivals of your grandeur? When your troops were few and defenseless, did we take advantage of their distress, and expel them our towns, or have we permitted them to fortify, to receive new aid, and to acquire additional strength?

Let not your enemies and ours persuade you that in this we were influenced by fear, or any other unworthy motive. The lives of Britons are still dear to us. They are the children of our parents, and an uninterrupted intercourse of mutual benefits had knit the bonds of friendship. When hostilities were commenced — when on a late occasion we were wantonly attacked by your troops, though we repelled their assaults and returned their blows, yet we lamented the wounds they obliged us to give; nor have we yet learned to rejoice at a victory over Englishmen.

As we wish not to color our actions or disguise our thoughts, we shall, in the simple language of truth, avow the measures we have pursued, the motives upon which we have acted, and our future designs.

When our late petition to the throne produced no other effect than fresh injuries, and votes of your legislature, calculated to justify every severity; when your fleets and your armies were prepared to wrest from us our property, to rob us of our liberties or our lives; when the hostile attempts of General Gage evinced his designs, we levied armies for our security and defense. When the powers vested in the governor of Canada gave us reason to apprehend danger from that quarter, and we had frequent intimations that a cruel and savage enemy was to be let loose upon the defenseless inhabitants of our frontiers, we took such measures as prudence dictated, as necessity will justify. We possessed ourselves of Crown Point and Ticonderoga. Yet give us leave most solemnly to assure you that we have not yet lost sight of the object we have ever had in view — a reconciliation with you on constitutional principles, and a restoration of that friendly intercourse which, to the advantage of both, we till lately maintained.

The inhabitants of this country apply themselves chiefly to agriculture and commerce. As their fashions and manners are similar to yours, your markets must afford them the conveniences and luxuries for which they exchange the produce of their labors. The wealth of this extended continent centres with you; and our trade is so regulated as to be subservient only to your interest. You are too reasonable to expect that by taxes (in addition to this) we should contribute to your expense; to believe after diverting the fountain, that the streams can flow with unabated force.

It has been said that we refuse to submit to the restrictions on our commerce. From whence is this inference drawn? Not from our words; we have repeatedly declared the contrary, and we again profess our submission to the several acts of trade and navigation passed before the year 1763, trusting, nevertheless, in the equity and justice of Parliament, that such of them as, upon cool and impartial consideration, shall appear to have imposed unnecessary or grievous restrictions, will, at some happier period, be repealed or altered. And we cheerfully consent to the operation of such acts of the British Parliament as shall be restrained to the regulation of our external commerce, for the purpose of securing the commercial advantages of the whole empire to the mother country, and the commercial benefits of its respective members; excluding every idea of taxation, internal or external,

for raising a revenue on the subjects in America without their consent.

It is alleged that we contribute nothing to the common defense. To this we answer that the advantages which Great Britain receives from the monopoly of our trade far exceed our proportion of the expense necessary for that purpose. But should these advantages be inadequate thereto, let the restrictions on our trade be removed, and we will cheerfully contribute such proportion when constitutionally required.

It is a fundamental principle of the British Constitution that every man should have at least a representative share in the formation of those laws by which he is bound. Were it otherwise, the regulation of our internal police by a British Parliament who are, and ever will be, unacquainted with our local circumstances, must be always inconvenient, and frequently oppressive, working our wrong, without yielding any possible advantage to you.

A plan of accommodation (as it has been absurdly called) has been proposed by your ministers to our respective assemblies. Were this proposal free from every other objection but that which arises from the time of the offer, it would not be unexceptionable. Can men deliberate with the bayonet at their breast? Can they treat with freedom while their towns are sacked; when daily instances of injustice and oppression disturb the slower operations of reason?

If this proposal is really such as you would offer, and we accept, why was it delayed till the nation was put to useless expense, and we were reduced to our present melancholy situation? If it holds forth nothing, why was it proposed, unless, indeed, to deceive you into a belief that we were unwilling to listen to any terms of accommodation. But what is submitted to our consideration? We contend for the disposal of our property. We are told that our demand is unreasonable — that our Assemblies may indeed collect our money, but that they must, at the same time, offer, not what your exigencies or ours may require, but so much as shall be deemed sufficient to satisfy the desires of a minister, and enable him to provide for favorites and dependants. A recurrence to your own treasury will convince you how little of the money already extorted from us has been applied to the relief of your burthens. To suppose that we would thus grasp the shadow, and give up the substance, is adding insult to injuries.

We have, nevertheless, again presented an humble and dutiful petition to our sovereign; and to remove every imputation of obstinacy have requested his Majesty to direct some mode by which the united applications of his faithful colonists may be improved into a happy and permanent reconciliation. We are willing to treat on such terms as can alone render an accommodation lasting, and we flatter ourselves that our pacific endeavors will be attended with a removal of ministerial troops, and a repeal of those laws of the operation of which we complain, on the one part, and a disbanding of our army and a dissolution of our commercial associations, on the other.

Yet, conclude not from this that we propose to surrender our property into the hands of your ministry, or vest your Parliament with a power which may terminate in our destruction. The great bulwarks of our Constitution we have desired to maintain by every temperate, by every peaceable means; but your ministers (equal foes to British and American freedom) have added to their former oppressions an attempt to reduce us, by the sword, to a base and abject submission. On the sword, therefore, we are compelled to rely for protection. Should victory declare in your favor, yet men trained to arms from their infancy, and animated by the love of liberty, will afford neither a cheap nor easy conquest. Of this, at least, we are assured, that our struggle will be glorious, our success certain; since, even in death, we shall find that freedom which in life you forbid us to enjoy.

Let us now ask what advantages are to attend our reduction. The trade of a ruined and desolate country is always inconsiderable, its revenue trifling; the expense of subjecting and retaining it in subjection, certain and inevitable. What, then, remains but the gratification of an ill-judged pride, or the hope of rendering us subservient to designs on your liberty?

Soldiers who have sheathed their swords in the bowels of their American brethren will not draw them with more reluctance against you. When too late, you may lament the loss of that freedom which we exhort you, while still in your power, to preserve.

On the other hand, should you prove unsuccessful; should that connection which we most ardently wish to maintain be dissolved; should your ministers exhaust your treasures, and waste the blood of your countrymen in vain attempts on our

liberty, do they not deliver you, weak and defenseless, to your natural enemies?

Since, then, your liberty must be the price of your victories, your ruin of your defeat,— what blind fatality can urge you to a pursuit destructive of all that Britons hold dear?

If you have no regard to the connection which has for ages subsisted between us; if you have forgotten the wounds we have received fighting by your side for the extension of the empire; if our commerce is not an object below your consideration; if justice and humanity have lost their influence on your hearts, still motives are not wanting to excite your indignation at the measures now pursued. Your wealth, your honor, your liberty are at stake.

Notwithstanding the distress to which we are reduced, we sometimes forget our own afflictions, to anticipate and sympathize in yours. We grieve that rash and inconsiderate counsels should precipitate the destruction of an empire which has been the envy and admiration of ages; and call God to witness that we would part with our property, endanger our lives, and sacrifice everything but liberty, to redeem you from ruin.

A cloud hangs over your heads and ours: ere this reaches you, it may probably burst upon us; let us, then (before the remembrance of former kindness is obliterated), once more repeat those appellations which are ever grateful in our ears; let us entreat heaven to avert our ruin, and the destruction that threatens our friends, brethren, and countrymen on the other side of the Atlantic.

ARCHBISHOP LEIGHTON

(1611–1684)

ROBERT LEIGHTON, Principal of the University of Edinburgh, and Archbishop of Glasgow, was one of the greatest orators and preachers of his time. One of his biographers says of him: "As a saint, author, and peacemaker, Leighton presents a combination of qualities which has called forth almost unrivaled tributes of admiration." Those who read his sermon, 'Immortality,' will see that he has such a mastery of musical and idiomatic English as has belonged only to few great speakers and writers. He was born at Edinburgh in 1611, and was originally a minister of the Presbyterian Church. On his accession to the Church of England, he was in great favor at court and was made Bishop of Dunblane and afterwards Archbishop of Glasgow. It is said that "these honors were almost forced upon him." He finally resigned his Archbishopric, and died in retirement, June 25th, 1684.

IMMORTALITY

THERE are many things that keep mankind employed, particularly business, or rather trifles; for so the affairs which are in this world considered as most important ought to be called when compared to that of minding our own valuable concerns, knowing ourselves, and truly consulting our highest interests; but how few are there that make this their study! The definition you commonly give of man is that he is a rational creature; though, to be sure, it is not applicable to the generality of mankind, unless you understand that they are such, not actually, but in power only, and that very remote. They are, for the most part at least, more silly and foolish than children, and, like them, fond of toys and rattles; they fatigue themselves, running about and sauntering from place to place, but do nothing to the purpose!

What a wonder it is that souls of a heavenly original have so far forgot their native country and are so immersed in dirt and

mud that there are few men who frequently converse with themselves about their own state, thinking gravely of their original and their end, seriously laying to heart that, as the poet expresses it: "Good and evil are laid before mankind"; and who, after mature consideration, not only think it the most wise and reasonable course, but are also fully resolved to exert themselves to the utmost, in order to arrive at a sovereign contempt of earthly things and aspire to those enjoyments that are divine and eternal. For our parts, I am fully persuaded we shall be of this mind, if we seriously reflect upon what has been said. For if there is, of necessity, a complete, permanent, and satisfying good intended for man, and no such good is to be found in the earth or earthly things, we must proceed further, and look for it somewhere else, and, in consequence of this, conclude that man is not quite extinguished by death, but removes to another place, and that the human soul is by all means immortal.

Many men have added a great variety of different arguments to support this conclusion, some of them strong and solid, and others, to speak freely, too metaphysical, and of little strength, especially as they are obscure, as easily denied, and as hard to be proved, as that very conclusion in support of which they are adduced.

They who reason from the immaterial nature of the soul, and from its being infused into the body, as also from its method of operation, which is confined to none of the bodily organs, may easily prevail with those who believe these principles, to admit the truth of the conclusion they draw from them; but if they meet with any who obstinately deny the premises, or even doubt the truth of them, it will be a matter of difficulty to support such hypothesis with clear and conclusive arguments. If the soul of man were well acquainted with itself, and fully understood its own nature; if it could investigate the nature of its union with the body, and the method of its operation therein, we doubt not but from thence it might draw these and other such arguments of its immortality; but since, shut up in the prison of a dark body, it is so little known, and so incomprehensible to itself, and since, in so great obscurity, it can scarce, if at all, discover the least of its own features and complexion, it would be a very difficult matter for it to say much concerning its internal nature, or nicely determine the methods of its operation. But it would be surprising if any one should deny that the very operations it

performs, especially those of the more noble and exalted sort, are strong marks and conspicuous characters of its excellence and immortality.

Nothing is more evident than that, besides life and sense and animal spirits, which he has in common with the brutes, there is in man something more exalted, more pure, and that more nearly approaches to Divinity. God has given to the former a sensitive soul, but to us a mind also; and, to speak distinctly, that spirit which is peculiar to man, and whereby he is raised above all other animals, ought to be called mind rather than soul. Be this as it may, it is hardly possible to say how vastly the human mind excels the other with regard to its wonderful powers, and, next to them, with respect to its works, devices, and inventions. For it performs such great and wonderful things, that the brutes, even those of the greatest sagacity, can neither imitate, nor at all understand, much less invent. Nay, man, though he is much less in bulk and inferior in strength to the greatest part of them, yet, as lord and king of them all, he can, by surprising means, bend and apply the strength and industry of all the other creatures, the virtues of all herbs and plants, and, in a word, all the parts and powers of this visible world, to the convenience and accommodation of his own life. He also builds cities, erects commonwealths, makes laws, conducts armies, fits out fleets, measures not only the earth, but the heavens also, and investigates the motions of the stars. He foretells eclipses many years before they happen; and, with very little difficulty, sends his thoughts to a great distance; bids them visit the remotest cities and countries, mounts above the sun and the stars, and even the heavens themselves.

But all these things are inconsiderable and contribute but little to our present purpose in respect of that one incomparable dignity that results to the human mind from its being capable of religion, and having indelible characters thereof naturally stamped upon it. It acknowledges a God, and worships him; it builds temples to his honor; it celebrates his never-enough exalted majesty with sacrifices, prayers, and praises; depends upon his bounty; implores his aid; and so carries on a constant correspondence with heaven; and, which is a very strong proof of its being originally from heaven, it hopes at last to return to it. And truly, in my judgment, this previous impression and hope of immortality and these earnest desires after it are a very strong

evidence of that immortality. These impressions, though in most men they lie overpowered, and almost quite extinguished by the weight of their bodies and an extravagant love of present enjoyments; yet, now and then, in time of adversity, they break forth and exert themselves, especially under the pressure of severe distempers and at the approaches of death. But those whose minds are purified and their thoughts habituated to divine things, with what constant and ardent wishes do they breathe after that blessed immortality? How often do their souls complain within them that they have dwelt so long in these earthly tabernacles? Like exiles, they earnestly wish, make interest, and struggle hard, to regain their native country. Moreover, does not that noble neglect of the body and its senses, and that contempt of all the pleasures of the flesh, which these heavenly souls have attained, evidently show that, in a short time, they will be taken from hence, and that the body and soul are of a very different and almost contrary nature to one another; that, therefore, the duration of one depends, not upon the other, but is quite of another kind; and that the soul, set at liberty from the body, is not only exempted from death, but, in some sense, then begins to live and then first sees light? Had we not this hope to support us, what ground should we have to lament our first nativity, which placed us in a life so short, so destitute of good, and so crowded with miseries; a life which we pass entirely in grasping phantoms of felicity, and suffering real calamities! So that, if there were not beyond this a life and happiness that more truly deserves these names, who can help seeing that, of all creatures, man would be the most miserable and, of all men, at the best, the most unhappy?

For, although every wise man looks upon the belief of the immortality of the soul as one of the great and principal supports of religion, there may be possibly some rare, exalted, and truly divine minds, who could choose the pure and noble path of virtue for its own sake, would constantly walk in it, and, out of love to it, would not decline the severest hardships, if they should happen to be exposed to them on its own account. Yet it cannot be denied that the common sort of Christians, though they are really and at heart sound believers and true Christians, fall very far short of this attainment, and would scarcely, if at all, embrace virtue and religion, if you take away the rewards; which I think the Apostle Paul hints at in this expression: "If in this

life only we have hope, we are of all men the most miserable." The Apostle, indeed, does not intend these words as a direct proof of the immortality of the soul in a separate state, but an argument to prove the resurrection of the body; which is a doctrine near akin, and closely connected with the former. For that great restoration is added as an instance of the superabundance and immensity of the Divine Goodness, whose pleasure it is that, not only the better and more divine part of man, which, upon its return to its original source, is, without its body, capable of enjoying a perfectly happy and eternal life, should have a glorious immortality, but also that this earthly tabernacle, as being the faithful attendant and constant companion of the soul through all its toils and labors in this world, be also admitted to a share and participation of its heavenly and eternal felicity; that so, according to our Lord's expression, every faithful soul may have returned into his bosom, good measure, pressed down, shaken together, and running over.

Let our belief of this immortality be founded entirely on divine revelation; and then, like a city fortified with a rampart of earth drawn round it, let it be outwardly guarded and defended by reason, which, in this case, suggests arguments as strong and convincing as the subject will admit of. If any one in the present case promises demonstration, his undertaking is certainly too much; if he desires it or accepts it from another, he requires too much. There are, indeed, very few demonstrations in philosophy, if you accept mathematical sciences, that can be truly and strictly so called; and, if we inquire narrowly into the matter, perhaps we shall find none at all; nay, if even the mathematical demonstrations are examined by the strict rules and ideas of Aristotle, the greatest part of them will be found imperfect and defective. The saying of that philosopher is, therefore, wise and applicable to many cases: "Demonstrations are not to be expected in all cases, but so far as the subject will admit of them." But if we were well acquainted with the nature and essence of the soul, or even its precise method of operation on the body, it is highly probable we could draw from thence evident and undeniable demonstrations of that immortality which we are now asserting; whereas, so long as the mind of man is so little acquainted with its own nature, we must not expect any such.

But that unquenchable thirst of the soul, which we have already mentioned, is a strong proof of its divine nature; a thirst

not to be allayed with the impure and turbid waters of any earthly good, or of all worldly enjoyments taken together. It thirsts after the never-failing fountain of good, according to that of the Psalmist: "As the hart panteth after the water brooks." It thirsts after a good, invisible, immaterial, and immortal, to the enjoyment whereof the ministry of a body is so far from being absolutely necessary that it feels itself shut up and confined by that to which it is now united, as by a partition wall, and groans under the pressure of it. And those souls that are quite insensible of this thirst are certainly buried in the body as in the carcass of an impure hog; nor have they so entirely divested themselves of this appetite we have mentioned, nor can they possibly so divest themselves of it as not to feel it severely to their great misery, sooner or later, either when they awake out of their lethargy within the body, or when they are obliged to leave it. To conclude: Nobody, I believe, will deny that we are to form our judgment of the true nature of the human mind, not from the sloth and stupidity of the most degenerate and vilest of men, but from the sentiments and fervent desires of the best and wisest of the species.

These sentiments concerning the immortality of the soul in its future existence, not only do include no impossibility or absurdity in them, but are also very agreeable to sound reason, wisdom, and virtue, to the divine economy, and the natural wishes and desires of men; wherefore most nations have, with the greatest reason, universally adopted them, and the wisest in all countries and in all ages have cheerfully embraced them.

SPEAKER LENTHALL

(1591–1662)

WILLIAM LENTHALL'S address as Speaker on opening the Long Parliament is a unique example of confession and avoidance in official oratory. Under what is, apparently, its fulsome flattery of the King, is the veiled threat of parliamentary «vigilancy for the preservation of ancient liberties.» Lenthall showed his quality not long afterwards by his defense of the privileges of Parliament when an attempt was made to arrest its members by royal authority. He was born at Henley-on-Thames, in June 1591. Before his election as Speaker of the Long Parliament, he had been a member of the Short Parliament. He was afterwards Speaker of Cromwell's first Parliament and a member of the Parliament of 1656. He died September 3d, 1662.

OPENING THE LONG PARLIAMENT UNDER CHARLES I.

(Address as Speaker, November 5th, 1640)

Most Gracious and Dread Sovereign:—

IN ALL submissive humbleness, the knights, citizens, and burgesses of the House of Commons are here assembled who, taking along with them your gracious inclination, have, according to their ancient liberties, designed me their Speaker.

Whereas, I cannot but lament to think how great a mist may overcast the hopes of this session, yet it is a note of favor to me, who cannot but judge myself unfit for so great employment, which so appears to the whole world. Many there be of deep judgment and sad experience that might have added lustre to this action and expedition to the work, if they had pleased to have left me in that mean condition they found me.

«*Non mihi tacuisse nocet, nocet esse locutum.*»

And then might your sacred and pious intentions have had their full advancement.

But is it yet too late? may I not appeal to Cæsar? Yes, I may, and in the lowest posture of humility I humbly beseech

your sacred Majesty to interpose your royal authority to command a review of the House, for there were never more than now fitted for such employments.

[Then the Lord Keeper, by his Majesty's direction, approved of him and the Commons' choice. Upon which he proceeded thus: —]

It pleaseth not your sacred Majesty to vouchsafe a change. Actions of kings are not to be by me reasoned.

Therefore being emboldened by this gracious approbation, give me leave a little, dread Sovereign, to express my thoughts unto our gracious Lord the King.

I see before my eyes with admiration the Majesty of Great Britain, the glory of the times, the history of honor, Charles I., placed in the forefront by descent of antiquity, on a throne settled by a long succession and continued to us by a pious and peaceful government.

On the one side, the monument of glory, the progeny of valiant and puissant princes, the Queen's most excellent Majesty.

On the other side, the hopes of posterity and joy of this nation, those olive branches set round your tables, emblems of peace to posterity.

Here shine those lights and lamps placed in a mount, which attend your sacred Majesty as supreme head, and borrow from you the splendor of their government.

There the true state of nobility, figures of prowess and magnanimity, fitted by their long-contracted honor in their blood, for the counsel of princes.

In the midst of those, the reverend judges, whither both parties (as to the oracles of judgment and justice) may resort, cisterns that hold fair waters, wherein each deviation, each wrinkle is discernable, and from thence, as from the centre, each crooked line ought to be leveled. The footstool of your throne is fixed there, which renders you glorious to all posterity.

Here we, the knights, citizens, and burgesses of the Commons House, at your royal feet, contracted from all parts of your kingdom, come as ensigns of obedience and humility, all united by the law equally distributed, which cements this great body to the obedience of your sacred Majesty, and compels the hearts, as well as the hands, to contribute for the preservation of your Majesty, and the common interest,—the law that dissipates the invaders of

the Church and Commonwealth, and discovers their impostures, but (give me leave dread Sovereign) knits the Crown to the sacred temples, and frees Majesty from the interpretation of misdoing.

Amongst these, this great council is most sovereign against the distempers of this nation.

Were they infested at sea, troubled at home, or invaded from abroad, here was the sanctuary of refuge, hither was the resort, and no other way found for a foundation of peace.

It is reported of Constantine the Great that he accompted his subjects purse his Exchequer, and so it is. Subtle inventions may pick the purse, but nothing can open it but a Parliament; which lets in the eye of Sovereignty upon the public maladies of the State, and manifests vigilancy for the preservation of our ancient liberties. For this we need not search into antiquity; look but a little back, there we shall see our just liberties graciously confirmed by your most sacred Majesty.

And is our happiness shut up in the remembrance of times past only? No! Those gracious expressions lately fallen from your sacred lips, as honey from the comb, make glad the hearts of your people. So that now we do more than promise to ourselves a large and free consideration of the ways to compose the distempers of these kingdoms, and then present them to your royal hand for perfection. And such shall be our deportment, that as we shall labor for the continuance of our liberties, so shall we carry a high regard to preserve that sovereign power wherewith your Majesty is invested for the preservation of your kingdom, and to render your sacred Majesty terrible to the nations, and glorious at home.

Are these the fruits we have enjoyed by parliaments? We cannot, then, but wonder at that horrid invention in this place projected, *monstrum horrendum, informe ingens*, but the Lord be thanked, *cui lumen ademptum est.* Can this receive a palliation? Men, fathers, and brethren, and all at one blast, no reverence to the sacred bones of princes? Were we not all in a lump by them intended to be offered up to Moloch?

Let us never forget this day's solemnization but whither? It is too much boldness to presume longer on your Majesty's grace and goodness; and therefore, for the better expedition of this service, we humbly desire:—

First, that ourselves and servants may obtain freedom from arrests of their persons and goods.

Second, that we may have free liberty of speech without confinement, with a full and free debate.

Third, that your Majesty will vouchsafe our repair to your sacred person upon matters of importance, according to the ancient privileges of the House.

That with such alacrity we may now proceed to manifest to the world that our retirements were to re-enforce a greater unity and duty, and to endeavor a sweet violence which may compel (pardon, dread Sovereign, the word "compel") your Majesty to the love of parliaments.

And thus God will have the honor, your sacred Majesty the splendor, the Kingdom safety, and all our votes shall pass that your sacred Majesty may long, long, long, reign over us. And let all the people say Amen.

DAVID LEWIS, BISHOP OF LLANDAFF

(1617–1679)

IN 1679, in the reign of Charles II., David Lewis, Roman Catholic Bishop of Llandaff, was indicted and tried at Monmouth Assizes for High Treason, on the ground that "being a natural subject of the King of England, he passed beyond seas, took orders from the Church and See of Rome and returned back again to England and continued upward of forty days, contrary to the statute of 27th Elizabeth, in that case made and provided, which by the said statute is high treason." He was hanged, disemboweled, and quartered, August 27th, 1679, after conviction under the indictment. His dying speech, here given, is one of the most remarkable examples of oratory in the history of the scaffold. In pathos, in simplicity, in manly dignity, in the adequacy of its expression of the moral and intellectual qualities which do most to make human nature respectable, it illustrates the highest possibilities of eloquence.

Bishop Lewis was born at Abergavenny in 1617, of a Protestant family; but being converted to the Roman Catholic Church at an early age, he was educated at the English College in Rome, and began, in the Jesuit order, the ministry which ended in his martyrdom. For twenty-eight years, always at the risk of his life, he ministered to Roman Catholics of Wales, visiting them and holding services chiefly by night. During the political excitement created by Titus Oates, an ecclesiastic made an attack on Lewis which brought him to the scaffold, though at the trial it was clearly shown that his only offense had been holding religious services according to the rites of his church.

In England, in France, in Spain,—everywhere throughout Europe, then only partly civilized and hardly at all enlightened,—such enormous crimes were committed by politicians in the name of religion, whenever it suited their purposes. Whether these politicians were civil or ecclesiastical placeholders; whether they called themselves Catholic or Protestant, they were reactionists, whose crimes, failing always to achieve the purpose for which they were committed, served only to hasten the triumph of that genuine Christianity, illustrated when it was declared in America that no placeholder, in Church or State, should be allowed to use the police power of the State, represented by the jail, the policeman's club, and the gallows, to coerce

the consciences of others. It is hard for any one now to realize how much this means, but those who study the mournfully sublime struggle through which human progress has been achieved learn that every forward footprint has been blood-stained. W. V. B.

HIS SPEECH ON THE SCAFFOLD

(Delivered August 27th, 1679, at Uske, in Monmouthshire, where He Was Hanged)

I was never taught that doctrine of king-killing. From my soul I detest and abhor it as execrable and directly opposite to the principles of the religion I profess. (What that is, you shall know by and by!) it being the positive definition of the council of Constance: That "it is damnable for any subject, or private person, or any subjects in council joined, to murder his or their lawful king or prince, or use any public or clandestine conspiration against him," though the said king or prince were a Turk, apostate, persecutor, yea, or a tyrant in government. Never tell me of Clement, the murderer of Henry III. of France; never tell me of Ravilliac, murderer of Henry IV. of France; they did so, but wickedly they did so, and for it they were punished to severity, as malefactors; and for it, to this very day, are stigmatized by all Roman Catholics for very miscreants and villains. I hope you will not charge the whole Roman Catholic body with the villainies of some few desperadoes; but by that rule, all Christianity must be answerable for the treason of Judas. For my part, I have always loved my king. I always honored his person, and I daily prayed for his prosperity; and now, with all unfeigned cordiality, I say it: "God bless my gracious king and lawful prince, Charles II., King of England, and Prince of Wales! God bless him temporally and eternally! God preserve him from all his real enemies! God direct him in all his councils that may tend to the greater glory of the same great God; and whatever the late plot hath been, or is, the Father of Lights bring it to light, the contrivers of it, and the actors in it, that such may be brought to their condign punishment, and innocence may be preserved!"

But why again this untimely death? My religion is the Roman Catholic religion. In it I have lived above forty years. In it I now die; and so fixedly die, that if all the good things

in this world were offered to me to renounce it, all should not move me one hair's breadth from my Roman Catholic faith. A Roman Catholic I am, a Roman Catholic priest I am, a Roman Catholic priest of that religious order called the Society of Jesus I am; and I bless God who first called me, and I bless the hour in which I was first called, both unto that faith and function.

Please now to observe, I was condemned for reading mass, hearing confessions, administering the sacraments, anointing the sick, christening, marrying, preaching! As for reading the mass, it was the old, and still is, the accustomed and laudable liturgy of the Holy Church; and all the other acts, which are acts of religion tending to the worship of God; and for this dying, I die for religion. Moreover, know that when last May I was in London under examination concerning the plot, a prime examinant told me that to save my life and increase my fortunes I must make some discovery of the plot, or conform. Discover a plot I could not, for I knew of none; conform I would not, because it was against my conscience! Then, by consequence, I must die, and so now, dying, I die for conscience and religion; and dying upon such good scores, as far as human frailty permits, I die with alacrity, interior and exterior! From the abundance of the heart, let not only mouths, but faces also speak.

Here, methinks, I feel flesh and blood ready to burst into loud cries, tooth for tooth, eye for eye, blood for blood, life for life! No, crieth Holy Gospel, forgive and you shall be forgiven; pray for those that persecute you; love your enemies; and I profess myself a child of the Gospel, and the Gospel I obey.

Whomever, present or absent, I have ever offended, I humbly desire them to forgive me. As for my enemies, had I as many hearts as I have fingers, with all those hearts would I forgive my enemies. At least, with all that single heart I have, I freely forgive them all — my neighbors that betrayed me, the persons that took me, the justices that committed me, the witnesses that proved against me, the jury that found me, the judge that condemned me, and all others whomever that out of malice or zeal, covertly or openly, have been contributive to my condemnation; but singularly and especially, I forgive my capital persecutor, who hath been so long thirsty after my blood; from my soul I forgive him, and wish his soul so well, that, were it in my power, I would seat him a seraphim in heaven, and I pray for them in the language of glorious St. Stephen, the proto-

martyr: "Lord, lay not this sin unto them!" Or, better yet, in the style of our great master, Christ himself: "Father, forgive them, they know not what they do!"

And with reason I love them also, for though they have done themselves a vast soul-prejudice, yet they have done me an incomparable favor which I shall eternally acknowledge; but chiefly I love them for his sake, who said: "Love your enemies"; and in testimony of my love I wish them,—and it is the best of wishes,—from the centre of my soul, I wish them a good eternity. Oh, Eternity, Eternity! How momentary are the glorious riches and pleasures of this world! and how desirable art thou, endless Eternity!

And for my sad enemies, attaining thereunto I humbly beseech God to give them the grace of true repentance before they and this world part.

Next to my enemies, give me leave to lift up my eyes, hands, and heart to heaven, and drop some few words of advice unto, and for my friends, as well those present as absent. Friends, fear God, honor your king, be firm in your faith, avoid mortal sin by frequenting the sacraments of Holy Church, patiently bear your persecutions and afflictions, forgive your enemies! Your sufferings are great! I say, be firm in your faith to the end,—yea, even to death; then shall ye heap unto yourselves celestial treasures in the heavenly Jerusalem, where no thief robbeth, no moth eateth, and no rust consumeth! And have that blessed saying of the blessed St. Peter, prince of the Apostles, always in your memory, which I heartily recommend unto you, namely: "Let none of you suffer as a murderer or a thief, but if as a Christian, let him not be ashamed, but glorify God in his name!"

Now it is high time I make my address as to heaven, and supplicate the Divine Goodness in my own behalf, by some few short and cordial ejaculations of prayer.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

(1809–1865)

IN THE characters of peoples as of individuals, habits become faculties, and faculties abilities. In America the habits which in the course of a single century tamed a continent, raising it from savage wildness to high cultivation, have developed two faculties which it is the tendency of European life to keep rudimentary and inert. In power of spontaneous individual initiative; in ability to organize rapidly, compactly, and effectively for uncoerced co-operation, the American character has scarcely a parallel in history, unless it is to be looked for in that of the Hebrews under the Judges, the Athenians under the constitution of Solon, or the Germans of the time of Tacitus. Andrew Jackson at New Orleans seemed to represent and, indeed, did represent, a power to command obedience as great as that of Sesostris, Cæsar, or Napoleon. But at New Orleans, every rifleman, lying with his fellow-soldiers behind the breastworks and waiting to "see the whites of the enemy's eyes" was morally his own master as fully as if he had been alone in the vast woods of the Mississippi a hundred miles from the nearest house. All the powers of self-reliance acquired by lifelong habits of individual initiative remained in every member of Jackson's army, made effective by that desire to co-operate for a common purpose, which really constituted all there was of Jackson's authority. As it was with Jackson, the first great leader raised up by the American masses from their own ranks to represent their impulses, so it was also with Lincoln, who was his legitimate successor, created by and representing the same spirit. American leaders may be born, but they must be made also. Unless they are made by the people and become fully representative of popular impulses, they may be great poets, scientists, prophets, philosophers, leaders of future generations, but all they will get from their own will be the usual rewards of the unrepresentative. In their wars, in their politics, in their industrial activities, Americans, acting each for himself, and meeting constantly with contradiction, opposition, and the disorganization of temporary defeat, are constantly seeking some one on whom they can rally and reorganize. As walking is merely a process of falling and checking the fall before it is complete, so all the progress of the first century

of American life was the result of everlasting disorganization and reorganization. The secret of leadership under such circumstances is, first of all, willingness to lead. Any strong and representative man who, when lines are being broken, will push forward to be rallied upon, will find thousands seeking him, pushing him forward, and going with him, not only as far as he wishes, but often, if not usually, very much further than he ever intended to go or imagined himself capable of going.

Such a leader Lincoln became, strong in his generation and for after times, because he represented, or was capable of representing, more fully than any one else the dominant idea of his times. From Voltaire and Rousseau to Jefferson and Franklin, from Jefferson and Franklin to Danton and Vergniaud; from the American and French Revolutionists to the English Whigs and philanthropists, the Wilberforces, and the Broughams, the idea of the inalienable right of every man to own himself had gathered force, until in William Lloyd Garrison, in John Brown, in Wendell Phillips, enthusiasm for it was always a consuming passion and sometimes such an insanity as that which has made madmen reverenced among primitive peoples as "God's fools"—the inspired prophets of the will of heaven. Thoroughly sane, deeply serious, good-natured as it is given to few men to become, mournfully conscious of his own infirmities, chastened and disciplined by incessant mental struggle, by contradiction in family life as in public life, in his friendships as in his enmities, Lincoln became the greatest leader of his day, because the majority of the people, determined to go forward at any cost, saw their whole system of organization broken, and sought to rally on some one who would lead them forward and allow them to renew their organization.

In Lincoln they found one of the most skillful practical politicians —that is to say one of the greatest organizers—of modern times. As a practical politician he has not been equaled by any one in America, unless it be by Thomas Jefferson himself. Born in Hardin County, Kentucky, in 1809, when it was part of the extreme western frontier, springing from the lowest and least educated class; nursed in a mere hunter's "shack" with a clay floor and a bed made of stakes driven into the clay, he had experienced all the humiliations, all the contradictions, all the disturbances of the principle of self-love, which go to make the possibilities of the highest education for those whose egotism is suppressed while their individuality is developed by them. Having from his youth a "much-enduring mind," Lincoln learned early in his life that it would be worse than idle to attempt to give it full expression. Habitually suppressing himself, he came to wear habitually the appearance of the extreme simplicity

which belongs in reality only to those who have never experienced in their own suffering those reactions from the "manifold minds of men" which make the man who does experience them patiently, representative of the intellects, the passions, the impulses of his fellows, rather than of his own egotism. Lincoln was in this sense a representative man, understanding others without being understood by them. Over and above this, he was educated in every device of the practical politics of his day, always subtle in his processes, but using his subtlety — as here and there some great soldier has used physical force — to leave men freer than he found them.

He was great as an orator because he was great as a politician, a leader, an organizer. His second Inaugural and his speech at Gettysburg are immortal because they come from the soul — from the deep emotion of a man who habitually suppresses himself. They are unique, however, among his speeches. In the rest emotion governs his purpose merely. His utterance is governed by his intellect — subtle, cautious, habituated to retreat to its own ground before an advancing enemy, conceding everything, but surrendering nothing, confessing, avoiding, questioning, and only at the last attacking with irresistible force. Such a man is Titanic in his possibilities of good and evil, because he represents so nearly in their fullness the Titanic possibilities of the common, every-day human nature. With such men, as with all men, the good or evil of the sum of their lives depends on their direction. It is fortunate for America and for mankind that for Abraham Lincoln and his generation the direction was forward — forward at fearful cost, but, at any cost, forward!

W. V. B.

THE HOUSE DIVIDED AGAINST ITSELF

(Delivered at Springfield, Illinois, June 17th, 1858, at the Close of the Republican State Convention by which Mr. Lincoln Had Been Named for United States Senator)

Mr. President, and Gentlemen of the Convention: —

If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do, and how to do it.

We are now far into the fifth year since a policy was initiated with the avowed object and confident promise of putting an end to slavery agitation. Under the operation of that policy, that agitation has, not only not ceased, but has constantly augmented. In my opinion, it will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed. "A house divided against itself

cannot stand." I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved,— I do not expect the house to fall,— but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction; or its advocates will push it forward, till it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new — North as well as South.

Have we no tendency to the latter condition?

Let any one who doubts carefully contemplate that now almost complete legal combination — piece of machinery, so as to speak — compounded of the Nebraska doctrine and the Dred Scott decision. Let him consider not only what work the machinery is adapted to do, and how well adapted, but also let him study the history of its construction, and trace, if he can, or rather fail, if he can, to trace the evidence of design and concert of action among its chief architects, from the beginning.

The new year of 1854 found slavery excluded from more than half the States by State constitutions, and from most of the national territory by congressional prohibition. Four days later commenced the struggle which ended in repealing that congressional prohibition. This opened all the national territory to slavery, and was the first point gained.

But, so far, Congress only had acted, and an indorsement by the people, real or apparent, was indispensable, to save the point already gained and give chance for more.

This necessity had not been overlooked, but had been provided for, as well as might be, in the notable argument of "Squatter Sovereignty," otherwise called "sacred right of self-government," which latter phrase, though expressive of the only rightful basis of any government, was so perverted in this attempted use of it as to amount to just this: That if any one man choose to enslave another, no third man shall be allowed to object. That argument was incorporated into the Nebraska Bill itself, in the language which follows: —

"It being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their

domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States."

Then opened the roar of loose declamation in favor of "Squatter Sovereignty," and "sacred right of self-government." "But," said opposition members, "let us amend the bill so as to expressly declare that the people of the Territory may exclude slavery." "Not we," said the friends of the measure; and down they voted the amendment.

While the Nebraska Bill was passing through Congress, a law case involving the question of a negro's freedom, by reason of his owner having voluntarily taken him first into a Free State and then into a Territory covered by the congressional prohibition, and held him as a slave for a long time in each, was passing through the United States Circuit Court for the District of Missouri; and both Nebraska Bill and lawsuit were brought to a decision in the same month of May 1854. The negro's name was "Dred Scott," which name now designates the decision finally made in the case. Before the then next presidential election, the law case came to, and was argued in, the Supreme Court of the United States; but the decision of it was deferred until after the election. Still, before the election, Senator Trumbull, on the floor of the Senate, requested the leading advocate of the Nebraska Bill to state his opinion whether the people of a Territory can constitutionally exclude slavery from their limits; and the latter answers: "That is a question for the Supreme Court."

The election came, Mr. Buchanan was elected, and the indorsement, such as it was, secured. That was the second point gained. The indorsement, however, fell short of a clear popular majority by nearly four hundred thousand votes, and so, perhaps, was not overwhelmingly reliable and satisfactory. The outgoing President, in his last annual message, as impressively as possible, echoed back upon the people the weight and authority of the indorsement. The Supreme Court met again; did not announce their decision, but ordered a reargument. The presidential inauguration came, and still no decision of the court; but the incoming President in his Inaugural Address, fervently exhorted the people to abide by the forthcoming decision, whatever it might be. Then, in a few days, came the decision.

The reputed author of the Nebraska Bill finds an early occasion to make a speech at this capital, indorsing the Dred Scott

decision, and vehemently denouncing all opposition to it. The new President, too, seizes the early occasion of the Silliman letter to indorse and strongly construe that decision, and to express his astonishment that any different view had ever been entertained.

At length a squabble springs up between the President and the author of the Nebraska Bill, on the mere question of fact, whether the Lecompton Constitution was or was not, in any just sense, made by the people of Kansas; and in that quarrel the latter declares that all he wants is a fair vote for the people, and that he cares not whether slavery be voted down or voted up. I do not understand his declaration that he cares not whether slavery be voted down or voted up, to be intended by him other than as an apt definition of the policy he would impress upon the public mind — the principle for which he declares he has suffered so much, and is ready to suffer to the end. And well may he cling to that principle. If he has any parental feeling, well may he cling to it. That principle is the only shred left of his original Nebraska doctrine. Under the Dred Scott decision "Squatter Sovereignty" squatted out of existence, tumbled down like temporary scaffolding — like the mold at the foundry, served through one blast and fell back into loose sand — helped to carry an election, and then was kicked to the winds. His late joint struggle with the Republicans against the Lecompton Constitution involves nothing of the original Nebraska doctrine. That struggle was made on a point — the right of a people to make their own constitution — upon which he and the Republicans have never differed.

The several points of the Dred Scott decision, in connection with Senator Douglas's "care-not" policy, constitute the piece of machinery, in its present state of advancement. This was the third point gained. The working points of that machinery are: —

First, that no negro slave, imported as such from Africa, and no descendant of such slave, can ever be a citizen of any State, in the sense of that term as used in the Constitution of the United States. This point is made in order to deprive the negro, in every possible event, of the benefit of that provision of the United States Constitution, which declares that: "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States."

Second, that "subject to the Constitution of the United States," neither Congress nor a Territorial legislature can ex-

clude slavery from any United States Territory. This point is made in order that individual men may fill up the Territories with slaves, without danger of losing them as property, and thus to enhance the chances of permanency to the institution through all the future.

Third, that whether the holding a negro in actual slavery in a free State makes him free, as against the holder, the United States courts will not decide, but will leave to be decided by the courts of any slave State the negro may be forced into by the master. This point is made, not to be pressed immediately; but, if acquiesced in for a while, and apparently indorsed by the people at an election, then to sustain the logical conclusion that what Dred Scott's master might lawfully do with Dred Scott, in the free State of Illinois, every other master may lawfully do with any other one, or one thousand slaves, in Illinois, or in any other free State.

Auxiliary to all this, and working hand in hand with it, the Nebraska doctrine, or what is left of it, is to educate and mold public opinion, at least Northern public opinion, not to care whether slavery is voted down or voted up. This shows exactly where we now are; and partially, also, whither we are tending.

It will throw additional light on the latter, to go back, and run the mind over the string of historical facts already stated. Several things will now appear less dark and mysterious than they did when they were transpiring. The people were to be left "perfectly free," subject only to the Constitution. What the Constitution had to do with it, outsiders could not then see. Plainly enough now, it was an exactly fitted niche, for the Dred Scott decision to afterward come in, and declare the perfect freedom of the people to be just no freedom at all. Why was the amendment, expressly declaring the right of the people, voted down? Plainly enough now: the adoption of it would have spoiled the niche for the Dred Scott decision. Why was the court decision held up? Why even a Senator's individual opinion withheld, till after the presidential election? Plainly enough now: the speaking out then would have damaged the perfectly free argument upon which the election was to be carried. Why the outgoing President's felicitation on the indorsement? Why the delay of a re-argument? Why the incoming President's advance exhortation in favor of the decision? These things look

like the cautious patting and petting of a spirited horse, preparatory to mounting him, when it is dreaded that he may give the rider a fall. And why the hasty after-indorsement of the decision by the President and others?

We cannot absolutely know that all these exact adaptations are the result of preconcert. But when we see a lot of framed timbers, different portions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places, and by different workmen — Stephen, Franklin, Roger, and James, for instance — and when we see these timbers joined together, and see they exactly make the frame of a house or a mill, all the tenons and mortices exactly fitting, and all the lengths and proportions of the different pieces exactly adapted to their respective places, and not a piece too many or too few, — not omitting even scaffolding — or, if a single piece be lacking, we see the place in the frame exactly fitted and prepared yet to bring such piece in — in such a case, we find it impossible not to believe that Stephen and Franklin and Roger and James all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common plan or draft drawn up before the first blow was struck.

It should not be overlooked that, by the Nebraska Bill, the people of a State, as well as a Territory, were to be left "perfectly free," "subject only to the Constitution." Why mention a State? They were legislating for Territories, and not for or about States. Certainly the people of a State are and ought to be subject to the Constitution of the United States; but why is mention of this lugged into this merely Territorial law? Why are the people of a Territory and the people of a State therein lumped together, and their relation to the Constitution therein treated as being precisely the same? While the opinion of the court, by Chief-Justice Taney, in the Dred Scott case, and the separate opinions of all the concurring judges, expressly declare that the Constitution of the United States neither permits Congress nor a Territorial legislature to exclude slavery from any United States Territory, they all omit to declare whether or not the same Constitution permits a State, or the people of a State, to exclude it. Possibly this is a mere omission; but who can be quite sure, if McLean or Curtis had sought to get into the opinion a declaration of unlimited power in the people of a State to exclude slavery from their limits, just as Chase and Mace sought to get such declaration, in behalf of the people of a Ter-

ritory, into the Nebraska Bill — I ask, who can be quite sure that it would not have been voted down in the one case as it had been in the other? The nearest approach to the point of declaring the power of a State over slavery is made by Judge Nelson. He approaches it more than once, using the precise idea, and almost the language, too, of the Nebraska Act. On one occasion, his exact language is, "except in cases where the power is restrained by the Constitution of the United States, the law of the State is supreme over the subject of slavery within its jurisdiction." In what cases the power of the States is so restrained by the United States Constitution is left an open question, precisely as the same question, as to the restraint on the power of the Territories, was left open in the Nebraska Act. Put this and that together, and we have another nice little niche, which we may ere long see filled with another Supreme Court decision, declaring that the Constitution of the United States does not permit a State to exclude slavery from its limits. And this may especially be expected if the doctrine of "care not whether slavery be voted down or voted up," shall gain upon the public mind sufficiently to give promise that such a decision can be maintained when made.

Such a decision is all that slavery now lacks of being alike lawful in all the States. Welcome, or unwelcome, such decision is probably coming, and will soon be upon us, unless the power of the present political dynasty shall be met and overthrown. We shall lie down pleasantly dreaming that the people of Missouri are on the verge of making their State free, and we shall awake to the reality instead, that the Supreme Court has made Illinois a slave State. To meet and overthrow the power of that dynasty is the work now before all those who would prevent that consummation. This is what we have to do. How can we best do it?

There are those who denounce us openly to their own friends, and yet whisper us softly, that Senator Douglas is the aptest instrument there is with which to effect that object. They wish us to infer all from the fact that he now has a little quarrel with the present head of the dynasty; and that he has regularly voted with us on a single point, upon which he and we have never differed. They remind us that he is a great man, and that the largest of us are very small ones. Let this be granted. But "a living dog is better than a dead lion." Judge Douglas,

if not a dead lion, for this work, is at least a caged and toothless one. How can he oppose the advances of slavery? He does not care anything about it. His avowed mission is impressing the "public heart" to care nothing about it. A leading Douglas Democratic newspaper thinks Douglas's superior talent will be needed to resist the revival of the African slave trade. Does Douglas believe an effort to revive that trade is approaching? He has not said so. Does he really think so? But if it is, how can he resist it? For years he has labored to prove it a sacred right of white men to take negro slaves into the new Territories. Can he possibly show that it is less a sacred right to buy them where they can be bought cheapest? And unquestionably they can be bought cheaper in Africa than in Virginia. He has done all in his power to reduce the whole question of slavery to one of a mere right of property; and as such, how can he oppose the foreign slave trade — how can he refuse that trade in that "property" shall be "perfectly free" — unless he does it as a protection to the home production? And as the home producers will probably not ask the protection, he will be wholly without a ground of opposition.

Senator Douglas holds, we know, that a man may rightfully be wiser to-day than he was yesterday — that he may rightfully change when he finds himself wrong. But can we, for that reason, run ahead, and infer that he will make any particular change, of which he, himself, has given no intimation? Can we safely base our action upon any such vague inference? Now, as ever, I wish not to misrepresent Judge Douglas's position, question his motives, or do aught that can be personally offensive to him. Whenever, if ever, he and we can come together on principle so that our cause may have assistance from his great ability, I hope to have interposed no adventitious obstacle. But clearly, he is not now with us — he does not pretend to be — he does not promise ever to be.

Our cause, then, must be intrusted to, and conducted by, its own undoubted friends — those whose hands are free, whose hearts are in the work — who do care for the result. Two years ago the Republicans of the nation mustered over thirteen hundred thousand strong. We did this under the single impulse of resistance to a common danger, with every external circumstance against us. Of strange, discordant, and even hostile elements, we gathered from the four winds, and formed and fought the battle

through, under the constant hot fire of a disciplined, proud, and pampered enemy. Did we brave all them to falter now?—now, when that same enemy is wavering, dissevered, and belligerent? The result is not doubtful. We shall not fail—if we stand firm, we shall not fail. Wise counsels may accelerate, or mistakes delay it, but, sooner or later, the victory is sure to come.

INTERROGATING DOUGLAS

(Delivered at the Second Joint Debate between Douglas and Lincoln, at Freeport, Illinois, August 27th, 1858)

Ladies and Gentlemen:—

On Saturday last Judge Douglas and myself first met in public discussion. He spoke one hour, I an hour and a half, and he replied for half an hour. The order is now reversed. I am to speak an hour, he an hour and a half, and then I am to reply for half an hour. I propose to devote myself during the first hour to the scope of what was brought within the range of his half-hour speech at Ottawa. Of course there was brought within the scope in that half-hour speech something of his own opening speech. In the course of that opening argument, Judge Douglas proposed to me seven distinct interrogatories. In my speech of an hour and a half, I attended to some other parts of his speech, and incidentally, as I thought, answered one of the interrogatories then. I then distinctly intimated to him that I would answer the rest of his interrogatories on condition only that he should agree to answer as many for me. He made no intimation at the time of the proposition, nor did he in his reply allude at all to that suggestion of mine. I do him no injustice in saying that he occupied at least half of his reply in dealing with me as though I had refused to answer his interrogatories. I now propose that I will answer any of the interrogatories upon condition that he will answer questions from me not exceeding the same number. I give him an opportunity to respond. The Judge remains silent. I now say that I will answer his interrogatories, whether he answers mine or not; and that after I have done so I shall propound mine to him.

I have supposed myself, since the organization of the Republican party at Bloomington, in May 1856, bound as a party man by the platforms of the party, then and since. If, in any

interrogatories which I shall answer, I go beyond the scope of what is within these platforms, it will be perceived that no one is responsible but myself.

Having said thus much I will take up the Judge's interrogatories as I find them printed in the Chicago Times, and answer them *seriatim*. In order that there may be no mistake about it, I have copied the interrogatories in writing, and also my answers to them. The first of these interrogatories is in these words: —

Question 1. — I desire to know whether Lincoln to-day stands, as he did in 1854, in favor of the unconditional repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law.

Answer. — I do not now, nor ever did, stand in favor of the unconditional repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law.

Q. 2. I desire him to answer whether he stands pledged to-day, as he did in 1854, against the admission of any more slave States into the Union, even if the people want them.

A. — I do not now, nor ever did, stand pledged against the admission of any more slave States into the Union.

Q. 3. — I want to know whether he stands pledged against the admission of a new State into the Union with such a Constitution as the people of that State may see fit to make.

A. — I do not stand pledged against the admission of a new State into the Union, with such a Constitution as the people of that State may see fit to make.

Q. 4. — I want to know whether he stands to-day pledged to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia.

A. — I do not stand to-day pledged to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia.

Q. 5. — I desire him to answer whether he stands pledged to the prohibition of the slave trade between the different States.

A. — I do not stand pledged to the prohibition of the slave trade between the different States.

Q. 6. — I desire to know whether he stands pledged to prohibit slavery in all the Territories of the United States, north as well as south of the Missouri Compromise line.

A. — I am impliedly, if not expressly, pledged to a belief in the right and duty of Congress to prohibit slavery in all the United States Territories.

Q. 7. — I desire him to answer whether he is opposed to the acquisition of any new territory unless slavery is first prohibited therein.

A. — I am not generally opposed to honest acquisition of territory; and, in any given case, I would or would not oppose such acquisition,

accordingly as I might think such acquisition would or would not aggravate the slavery question among ourselves.

Now, my friends, it will be perceived upon an examination of these questions and answers, that so far I have only answered that I was not pledged to this, that, or the other. The Judge has not framed his interrogatories to ask me anything more than this, and I have answered in strict accordance with the interrogatories, and have answered truly that I am not pledged at all upon any of the points to which I have answered. But I am not disposed to hang upon the exact form of his interrogatory. I am rather disposed to take up at least some of these questions, and state what I really think upon them.

As to the first one, in regard to the Fugitive Slave Law, I have never hesitated to say, and I do not now hesitate to say, that I think, under the Constitution of the United States, the people of the Southern States are entitled to a congressional Fugitive Slave Law. Having said that, I have had nothing to say, in regard to the existing Fugitive Slave Law, further than that I think it should have been framed so as to be free from some of the objections that pertain to it, without lessening its efficiency. And inasmuch as we are not now in an agitation in regard to an alteration or modification of that law, I would not be the man to introduce it as a new subject of agitation upon the general question of slavery.

In regard to the other question, of whether I am pledged to the admission of any more slave States into the Union, I state to you very frankly that I would be exceedingly sorry ever to be put in a position of having to pass upon that question. I should be exceedingly glad to know that there would never be another slave State admitted into the Union; but I must add that if slavery shall be kept out of the Territories during the territorial existence of any one given territory, and then the people shall, having a fair opportunity and a clear field, when they come to adopt the Constitution, do such an extraordinary thing as adopt a slave Constitution, uninfluenced by the actual presence of the institution among them, I see no alternative, if we own the country, but to admit them into the Union.

The third interrogatory is answered by the answer to the second, it being, as I conceive, the same as the second.

The fourth one is in regard to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. In relation to that, I have my mind very

distinctly made up. I should be exceedingly glad to see slavery abolished in the District of Columbia. I believe that Congress possesses the constitutional power to abolish it. Yet, as a member of Congress, I should not, with my present views, be in favor of endeavoring to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, unless it would be upon these conditions: First, that the abolition should be gradual; second, that it should be on a vote of the majority of qualified voters in the district; and, third, that compensation should be made to unwilling owners. With these three conditions I confess I would be exceedingly glad to see Congress abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and, in the language of Henry Clay: "Sweep from our capital that foul blot upon our nation."

In regard to the fifth interrogatory, I must say here that, as to the question of the abolition of the slave trade between the different States, I can truly answer, as I have, that I am pledged to nothing about it. It is a subject to which I have not given that mature consideration that would make me feel authorized to state a position so as to hold myself entirely bound by it. In other words, that question has never been prominently enough before me to induce me to investigate whether we really have the constitutional power to do it. I could investigate it if I had sufficient time to bring myself to a conclusion upon that subject, but I have not done so, and I say so frankly to you here and to Judge Douglas. I must say, however, that if I should be of opinion that Congress does possess the constitutional power to abolish the slave trade among the different States, I should still not be in favor of the exercise of that power unless upon some conservative principle, as I conceive it, akin to what I have said in relation to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia.

My answer as to whether I desire that slavery should be prohibited in all the Territories of the United States is full and explicit within itself and cannot be made clearer by any comments of mine. So I suppose in regard to the question whether I am opposed to the acquisition of any more territory unless slavery is first prohibited therein, my answer is such that I could add nothing by way of illustration, or making myself better understood, than the answer which I have placed in writing.

Now in all this, the Judge has me, and he has me on the record. I suppose he had flattered himself that I was really entertaining one set of opinions for one place and another set for

another place — that I was afraid to say at one place what I uttered at another. What I am saying here I suppose I say to a vast audience as strongly tending to Abolitionism as any audience in the State of Illinois, and I believe I am saying that which, if it would be offensive to any persons and render them enemies to myself, would be offensive to persons in this audience.

I now proceed to propound to the Judge the interrogatories, so far as I have framed them. I will bring forward a new installment when I get them ready. I will bring them forward now, only reaching to number four.

The first one is: —

Question 1. — If the people of Kansas shall, by means entirely unobjectionable in all other respects, adopt a State constitution, and ask admission into the Union under it, before they have the requisite number of inhabitants according to the English Bill, — some ninety-three thousand, — will you vote to admit them?

Q. 2. — Can the people of a United States Territory, in any lawful way, against the wish of any citizen of the United States, exclude slavery from its limits prior to the formation of a State constitution?

Q. 3. — If the Supreme Court of the United States shall decide that States cannot exclude slavery from their limits, are you in favor of acquiescing in, adopting, and following such decision as a rule of political action?

Q. 4. — Are you in favor of acquiring additional territory, in disregard of how such acquisition may affect the nation on the slavery question?

As introductory to these interrogatories which Judge Douglas propounded to me at Ottawa, he read a set of resolutions which he said Judge Trumbull and myself had participated in adopting in the first Republican State Convention, held at Springfield in October 1854. He insisted that I and Judge Trumbull, and perhaps the entire Republican party, were responsible for the doctrines contained in the set of resolutions which he read, and I understand that it was from that set of resolutions that he deduced the interrogatories which he propounded to me, using these resolutions as a sort of authority for propounding those questions to me. Now I say here to-day that I do not answer his interrogatories because of their springing at all from that set of resolutions which he read. I answered them because Judge Douglas thought fit to ask them. I do not now, nor never did, recognize any responsibility upon myself in that set of resolutions. When

I replied to him on that occasion, I assured him that I never had anything to do with them. I repeat here to-day that I never, in any possible form, had anything to do with that set of resolutions. It turns out, I believe, that those resolutions were never passed in any convention held in Springfield. It turns out that they were never passed at any convention or any public meeting that I had any part in. I believe it turns out in addition to all this that there was not, in the fall of 1854, any convention holding a session at Springfield calling itself a Republican State Convention; yet it is true there was a convention, or assemblage of men calling themselves a convention, at Springfield, that did pass some resolutions. But so little did I really know of the proceedings of that convention, or what set of resolutions they had passed, though having a general knowledge that there had been such an assemblage of men there, that when Judge Douglas read the resolutions I really did not know but they had been the resolutions passed then and there. I did not question that they were the resolutions adopted, for I could not bring myself to suppose that Judge Douglas could say what he did upon this subject without knowing that it was true. I contented myself, on that occasion, with denying, as I truly could, all connection with them, not denying or affirming whether they were passed at Springfield. Now it turns out that he had got hold of some resolutions passed at some convention or public meeting in Kane County. I wish to say here that I don't conceive that in any fair and just mind this discovery relieves me at all. I had just as much to do with the convention in Kane County as that at Springfield. I am just as much responsible for the resolutions at Kane County as those at Springfield, the amount of the responsibility being exactly nothing in either case — no more than there would be in regard to a set of resolutions passed in the moon.

I allude to this extraordinary matter in this canvass for some further purpose than anything yet advanced. Judge Douglas did not make his statement upon that occasion as matters that he believed to be true, but he stated them roundly as being true, in such form as to pledge his veracity for their truth. When the whole matter turns out as it does, and when we consider who Judge Douglas is — that he is a distinguished Senator of the United States — that he has served nearly twelve years as such — that his character is not at all limited as an ordinary Senator of the United States, but that his name has become of world-wide

renown — it is most extraordinary that he should so far forget all the suggestions of justice to an adversary, or of prudence to himself, as to venture upon the assertion of that which the slightest investigation would have shown him to be wholly false. I can only account for his having done so upon the supposition that that evil genius which has attended him through his life, giving to him an apparent astonishing prosperity, such as to lead very many good men to doubt there being any advantage in virtue over vice — I say I can only account for it on the supposition that that evil genius has at last made up its mind to forsake him.

And I may add that another extraordinary feature of the Judge's conduct in this canvass — made more extraordinary by this incident — is that he is in the habit, in almost all the speeches he makes, of charging falsehood upon his adversaries, myself and others. I now ask whether he is able to find in anything that Judge Trumbull, for instance, has said, or in anything that I have said, a justification at all compared with what we have, in this instance, for that sort of vulgarity.

ON JOHN BROWN

(From the Speech at Cooper Institute, New York, February 27th, 1860)

You charge that we stir up insurrections among your slaves. We deny it; and what is your proof? Harper's Ferry! John Brown! John Brown was no Republican; and you have failed to implicate a single Republican in his Harper's Ferry enterprise. If any member of our party is guilty in that matter, you know it, or you do not know it. If you do know it, you are inexcusable to not designate the man, and prove the fact. If you do not know it, you are inexcusable to assert it, and especially to persist in the assertion after you have tried and failed to make the proof. You need not be told that persisting in a charge which one does not know to be true is simply a malicious slander.

Some of you admit that no Republican designedly aided or encouraged the Harper's Ferry affair, but still insist that our doctrines and declarations necessarily lead to such results. We do not believe it. We know we hold to no doctrine, and make no declarations, which were not held to and made by our fathers who framed the Government under which we live. You never

dealt fairly by us in relation to this affair. When it occurred, some important State elections were near at hand, and you were in evident glee with the belief that, by charging the blame upon us, you could get an advantage of us in those elections. The elections came, and your expectations were not quite fulfilled. Every Republican man knew that, as to himself at least, your charge was a slander, and he was not much inclined by it to cast his vote in your favor. Republican doctrines and declarations are accompanied with a continual protest against any interference whatever with your slaves, or with you about your slaves. Surely, this does not encourage them to revolt. True, we do, in common with our fathers, who framed the Government under which we live, declare our belief that slavery is wrong; but the slaves do not hear us declare even this. For anything we say or do, the slaves would scarcely know there is a Republican party. I believe they would not, in fact, generally know it but for your misrepresentations of us, in their hearing. In your political contests among yourselves, each faction charges the other with sympathy with Black Republicanism; and then, to give point to the charge, defines Black Republicanism to simply be insurrection, blood and thunder among the slaves.

Slave insurrections are no more common now than they were before the Republican party was organized. What induced the Southampton insurrection, twenty-eight years ago, in which, at least, three times as many lives were lost as at Harper's Ferry? You can scarcely stretch your very elastic fancy to the conclusion that Southampton was got up by Black Republicanism. In the present state of things in the United States, I do not think a general, or even a very extensive slave insurrection, is possible. The indispensable concert of action cannot be attained. The slaves have no means of rapid communication; nor can incendiary free men, black or white, supply it. The explosive materials are everywhere in parcels; but there neither are, nor can be supplied, the indispensable connecting trains.

Much is said by Southern people about the affection of slaves for their masters and mistresses; and a part of it, at least, is true. A plot for an uprising could scarcely be devised and communicated to twenty individuals before some one of them, to save the life of a favorite master or mistress, would divulge it. This is the rule, and the slave revolution in Hayti was not an exception to it, but a case occurring under peculiar circumstances. The

Gunpowder Plot of British history, though not connected with slaves, was more in point. In that case, only about twenty were admitted to the secret; and yet one of them, in his anxiety to save a friend, betrayed the plot to that friend, and, by consequence, averted the calamity. Occasional poisonings from the kitchen, and open or stealthy assassinations in the field, and local revolts extending to a score or so, will continue to occur as the natural results of slavery; but no general insurrection of slaves, as I think, can happen in this country for a long time. Whoever much fears, or much hopes, for such an event, will be alike disappointed.

In the language of Mr. Jefferson, uttered many years ago: "It is still in our power to direct the process of emancipation and deportation peaceably and in such slow degrees as that the evil will wear off insensibly and their places be, *pari passu*, filled up by free white laborers. If, on the contrary, it is left to force itself on, human nature must shudder at the prospect held up."

Mr. Jefferson did not mean to say, nor do I, that the power of emancipation is in the Federal Government. He spoke of Virginia; and, as to the power of emancipation, I speak of the slave-holding States only.

The Federal Government, however, as we insist, has the power of restraining the extension of the institution — the power to insure that a slave insurrection shall never occur on any American soil which is now free from slavery.

John Brown's effort was peculiar. It was not a slave insurrection. It was an attempt by white men to get up a revolt among slaves, in which the slaves refused to participate. In fact, it was so absurd that the slaves, with all their ignorance, saw plainly enough it could not succeed. That affair, in its philosophy, corresponds with many attempts, related in history, at the assassination of kings and emperors. An enthusiast broods over the oppression of a people till he fancies himself commissioned by heaven to liberate them. He ventures the attempt, which ends in little else than in his own execution. Orsini's attempt on Louis Napoleon, and John Brown's attempt at Harper's Ferry, were, in their philosophy, precisely the same. The eagerness to cast blame on old England, in the one case, and on New England, in the other, does not disprove the sameness of the two things.

And how much would it avail you, if you could, by the use of John Brown, Helper's book, and the like, break up the Repub-

lican organization? Human action can be modified to some extent, but human nature cannot be changed. There is a judgment and a feeling against slavery in this nation, which cast at least a million and a half of votes. You cannot destroy that judgment and feeling — that sentiment — by breaking up the political organization which rallies around it. You can scarcely scatter and disperse an army which has been formed into order in the face of your heaviest fire, but if you could, how much would you gain by forcing the sentiment which created it out of the peaceful channel of the ballot box into some other channel? What would that other channel probably be? Would the number of John Browns be lessened or enlarged by the operation?

THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

(Delivered at the Dedication of the National Cemetery at Gettysburg, November 19th, 1863)

FOURSCORE and seven years ago, our fathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We are met to dedicate a portion of it as the final resting-place of those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. But in a large sense we cannot dedicate,— we cannot consecrate,— we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our power* to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work that they have thus far so nobly carried on.† It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they here gave the last full

*Some versions have «our poor power.»

†«Which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced» in some versions.

measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that Government of the people, by the people and for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

SECOND INAUGURAL ADDRESS

(Delivered March 4th, 1865)

Fellow-Countrymen:—

At this second appearing to take the oath of the presidential office, there is less occasion for an extended address than at the first. Then a statement somewhat in detail of the course to be pursued seemed very fitting and proper; now, at the expiration of four years, during which public declarations have constantly been called forth concerning every point and place of the great contest which still absorbs attention and engrosses the energies of the nation, little that is new could be presented. The progress of our arms, upon which all else chiefly depends, is as well known to the public as to myself. It is, I trust, reasonably satisfactory and encouraging to all. With a high hope for the future, no prediction in that regard is ventured. On the occasion corresponding to this four years ago, all thoughts were anxiously directed to an impending civil war. All dreaded it. All sought to avoid it. While the Inaugural Address was being delivered from this place, devoted altogether to saving the Union without war, the insurgent agents were in the city seeking to destroy it without war,—seeking to dissolve the Union, and divide the effects by negotiating. Both parties deprecated war, but one of them would make war rather than let it perish, and war came. One-eighth of the whole population were colored slaves, not distributed generally over the Union, but located in the southern part. These slaves contributed a peculiar and powerful interest. All knew the interest would somehow cause war. To strengthen, perpetuate, and extend this interest was the object for which the insurgents would rend the Union by war, while the Government claimed no right to do more than restrict the territorial enlargement of it. Neither party expected the magnitude or duration which it has already attained; neither anticipated that the cause of the conflict might cease even before the conflict itself should cease. Each looked for an easier triumph

and a result less fundamental and astonishing. Both read the same Bible and pray to the same God. Each invokes his aid against the other. It may seem strange that any man should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing bread from the sweat of other men's faces; but let us judge not, that we be not judged. The prayer of both should not be answered; that of neither has been answered fully, for the Almighty has his own purposes. "Woe unto the world because of offenses, for it must needs be that offense come; but woe unto that man by whom the offense cometh." If we shall suppose American slavery one of those offenses which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through his appointed time, he now wills to remove, and that he gives to both North and South this terrible war, as was due to those by whom the offense came, shall we discern that there is any departure from those divine attributes which believers in the living God always ascribe to him? Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away; yet if it be God's will that it continue until the wealth piled by bondsmen by two hundred and fifty years' unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said that the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.

With malice towards none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and orphans; to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and a lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

HIS SPEECH BEFORE DEATH

(Delivered at Washington, April 11th, 1865 — He Was Shot April 14th, and Died on the 15th)

WE MEET this evening, not in sorrow, but in gladness of heart. The evacuation of Petersburg and Richmond, and surrender of the principal insurgent army, give hopes of a righteous peace, whose joyous expression cannot be restrained. In the midst of this, however, he from whom all blessings flow

must not be forgotten. A call for a national thanksgiving is being prepared, and will be duly promulgated. Nor must those whose harder part gives us the cause of rejoicing be overlooked; their honors must not be parceled out with others. I myself was near the front, and had the high pleasure of transmitting much of the good news to you; but no part of the honor for the plan or execution is mine. To General Grant, his skillful officers and brave men, it all belongs. The gallant navy stood ready, but was not in reach to take active part. By these recent successes, the reinauguration of the National Authority, the reconstruction of which has had a large share of thought from the first, is pressed much more closely upon our attention. It is fraught with great difficulty. Unlike a case of war between independent nations, there is no authorized organ for us to treat with,—no one man has authority to give up the rebellion for any other man. We simply must begin with, and mold from, disorganized and discordant elements. Nor is it a small additional embarrassment that we, the loyal people, differ among ourselves as to the mode, manner, and measure of reconstruction. As a general rule, I abstain from reading the reports of attacks upon myself, wishing not to be provoked by that to which I cannot properly return an answer. In spite of this precaution, however, it comes to my knowledge that I am much censured for some supposed agency in setting up and seeking to sustain the new State government of Louisiana. In this I have done just so much and no more than the public knows. In the annual Message of December 1863, and accompanying proclamation, I presented a plan of reconstruction, as the phrase goes, which I promised, if adopted by any State, would be acceptable to, and sustained by, the Executive Government of the nation. I distinctly stated that this was not the only plan which might possibly be accepted, and I also distinctly protested that the Executive claimed no right to say when or whether members should be entitled to seats in Congress from such States. This plan was in advance submitted to the Cabinet, and approved by every member of it. One of them suggested that I should then, and in that connection, apply the Emancipation Proclamation to the excepted parts of Virginia and Louisiana, that I should drop the suggestion about apprenticeship for freed people, and that I should omit the protest against my own power in regard to the admission of members to Congress; but even he approved every part and parcel of the plan which

has since been employed or touched by the action of Louisiana. The new constitution of Louisiana declaring emancipation of the whole State practically applies the proclamation to the whole part previously excepted; it does not adopt apprenticeship for freed people, and is silent, as it could not well be otherwise, about the admission of members to Congress. So that as it applied to Louisiana, every member of the Cabinet fully approved the plan. The Message went to Congress, and I received many commendations of the plan, written and verbal, and not a single objection to it from any professed Emancipationist came to my knowledge until after the news had reached Washington that the people of Louisiana had begun to move in accordance with it. From about July 1862, I had corresponded with different persons supposed to be interested in the reconstruction of the State government for Louisiana. When the Message of 1863, with the plan before mentioned, reached New Orleans, General Banks wrote me that he was confident the people, with his military cooperation, would reconstruct substantially on that plan. I wrote to him and some of them to try it. They tried it, and the result is known. Such has been my only agency in getting up the Louisiana government. As to sustaining it, my promise is out, as before stated, but as bad promises are better broken than kept, I shall treat this as a bad promise, and break it whenever I shall be convinced that keeping it is adverse to the public interest; but I have not yet been so convinced. I have been shown a letter on this subject, supposed to be an able one, in which the writer expresses regret that my mind has not seemed to be definitely fixed on the question whether seceded States, so called, are in the Union or out of it. It would, perhaps, add astonishment to his regret were he to learn that since I have found professed Union men endeavoring to answer that question, I have purposely forborne any public expression upon it, as it appears to me that that question has not been, nor yet is, a practically material one, and that any discussion of it while it thus remains practically immaterial could have no other effect than the mischievous one of dividing our friends. As yet, whatever it may become, that question is bad as a basis of controversy, and good for nothing at all.

We all agree that the seceded States, so called, are out of their proper practical relation with the Union, and the sole object of the Government, civil and military, in regard to these States,

is to again get them into that proper practical relation. I believe it is not only possible, but in fact easier, to do this without deciding, or even considering, whether those States have ever been out of the Union than with it. Finding themselves safely at home, it would be utterly immaterial whether they had been abroad. Let us all join in doing the acts necessary to restore the proper practical relations between these States and the Union, and each forever after innocently indulge his own opinion, whether in doing the acts he brought the States from without into the Union, or only gave them proper assistance, they never having been out of it. The amount of constituency, so to speak, on which the Louisiana government rests would be more satisfactory to all if it contained fifty thousand or thirty thousand, or even twenty thousand, instead of twelve thousand, as it does. It is also unsatisfactory to some that the elective franchise is not given to the colored men. I would myself prefer that it were now conferred on the very intelligent, and on those who serve our cause as soldiers. Still, the question is not whether the Louisiana government, as it stands, is quite all that is desirable. The question is: Will it be wiser to take it as it is, and help to improve it, or to reject it? Can Louisiana be brought into the proper practical relation with the Union sooner by sustaining or discarding her new State government? Some twelve thousand voters in the heretofore slave State of Louisiana have sworn allegiance to the Union, assumed to be the rightful political power of the State, held elections, organized a State government, adopted a free State constitution, giving the benefit of the public schools equally to white and black, and empowering the legislature to confer the elective franchise upon the colored man. This legislature has already voted to ratify the constitutional amendment recently passed by Congress abolishing slavery throughout the nation. These twelve thousand persons are thus fully committed to the Union, and to perpetuate freedom in the State,—committed to the very things, and nearly all the things, the nation wants; and they ask the nation's recognition and its assistance to make good this committal. Now, if we reject and spurn them, we do our utmost to disorganize and disperse them. We, in fact, say to the white man: "You are worthless or worse. We will neither help you nor be helped by you." To the blacks we say: "This cup of liberty which these your old masters hold to your lips we will dash from you, and leave you to the chances

of gathering the spilled and scattered contents in some vague and undefined when, where, or how." If this course, discouraging and paralyzing both white and black, has any tendency to bring Louisiana into proper practical relations with the Union, I have so far been unable to perceive it. If, on the contrary, we recognize and sustain the new Government of Louisiana, the reverse of all this is true. We encourage the hearts and nerve the arms of twelve thousand to adhere to their work, and argue for it, and proselyte for it, and fight for it, and feed it and grow it, and ripen it to a complete success. The colored man, too, in seeing all united for him, is inspired with vigilance, and energy, and daring, to the same end. Grant that he desires the elective franchise, will he not obtain it sooner by saving the already advanced steps toward it than by falling backwards over them? Concede that the new government of Louisiana is only to what it should be as the egg is to the fowl, we shall sooner have the fowl by hatching the egg than by smashing it. Again, if we reject Louisiana, we also reject our vote in favor of the proposed amendment to the National Constitution. To meet this proposition, it has been argued that no more than three-fourths of those States which have not attempted secession are necessary to validly ratify the amendment. I do not commit myself against this further than to say that such a ratification would be questionable and sure to be persistently questioned, while its ratification by three-fourths of all States would be unquestioned and unquestionable. I repeat the question: Can Louisiana be brought into proper practical relations with the Union sooner by sustaining or by discarding her new State Government? What has been said of Louisiana will apply to other States. And yet so great peculiarities pertain to each State, and such important and sudden changes occur in the same State, and, withal, so new and unprecedented is the whole case, that no exclusive and inflexible plan can safely be prescribed as to details and collaterals. Such an exclusive and inflexible plan would surely become an entanglement. Important principles may and must be inflexible. In the present situation, as the phrase goes, it may be my duty to make some new announcement to the people of the South. I am considering, and shall not fail to act when satisfied that action will be proper.

CHANCELLOR LIVINGSTON

(1746–1813)

ROBERT R. LIVINGSTON, generally known as Chancellor Livingston, was associated with Thomas Jefferson in two of the most important acts of American history. In 1776 he was appointed by Congress on the committee with Jefferson to draw up the Declaration of Independence, and having been sent as Minister to France during Jefferson's presidency, he was one of the principal agents in bringing about the purchase of Louisiana Territory. He was born in New York city, November 27th, 1746, and in 1773 was acting as Recorder of that city, a position from which he was removed by the Royalists because of his undisguised sympathy with the Revolutionists. In the New York Convention, held to consider the Federal Constitution, he was one of the most prominent debaters, leaning toward the system which Patrick Henry denounced as "Consolidation not Federation." On the adoption of the first constitution of New York, he became Chancellor of the State, holding that office until 1801, and in his capacity as Chief of the State Judiciary, administering the oath of office to President Washington at his first inauguration, in New York city, April 30th, 1789. He was one of the first to recognize the importance of the idea of applying steam to navigation, and he materially assisted Fulton in launching the first steamboat. He died in February 1813.

WEALTH AND POVERTY, ARISTOCRACY AND REPUBLICANISM

(Delivered June 17th, 1788, in the New York State Convention, Called to Consider the Federal Constitution)

THE gentleman from Duchess appears to have misapprehended some of the ideas which dropped from me. My argument was, that a republic might very properly be formed by a league of States, but that the laws of the general legislature must act and be enforced upon individuals. I am contending for this species of government. The gentlemen who have spoken in opposition to me have either misunderstood or perverted my meaning;

but, sir, I flatter myself it has not been misunderstood by the convention at large.

If we examine the history of federal republics, whose legislative powers were exercised only in States, in their collective capacity, we shall find in their fundamental principles the seeds of domestic violence and consequent annihilation. This was the principal reason why I thought the old Confederation would be forever impracticable.

Much has been said, sir, about the number which ought to compose the House of Representatives; and the question has been debated with great address by the gentlemen on both sides of the House. It is agreed that the representative body should be so small as to prevent the disorder inseparable from the deliberations of a mob, and yet sufficiently numerous to represent the interests of the people, and to be a safe depository of power. There is, unfortunately, no standard by which we can determine this matter. Gentlemen who think that a hundred may be the medium, in which the advantages of regular deliberation and the safety of the people are united, will probably be disposed to support the plan as it stands. Others, who imagine that no number less than three or four hundred can insure the preservation of liberty, will contend for an alteration. Indeed, sir, these effects depend so much upon contingency, and upon circumstances totally unconnected with the idea of numbers, that we ought not to be surprised at the want of a standing criterion. On so vague a subject, it is very possible that the opinions of no two gentlemen in this assembly, if they were governed by their own original reflections, would entirely coincide. I acknowledge myself one of those who suppose the number expressed in the Constitution to be about the proper medium; and yet future experience may induce me to think it too small or too large. When I consider the objects and powers of the General Government, I am of opinion that one hundred men may at all times be collected of sufficient information and integrity to manage well the affairs of the Union. Some gentlemen suppose that, to understand and provide for the general interests of commerce and manufactures, our legislators ought to know how all commodities are produced, from the first principle of vegetation to the last polish of mechanical labor; that they ought to be minutely acquainted with all the processes of all the arts. If this were true, it would be necessary that a great part of the British House of Commons

should be woolen drapers; yet we seldom find such characters in that celebrated assembly.

As to the idea of representing the feelings of the people, I do not entirely understand it, unless by their "feelings" are meant their interests. They appear to me to be the same thing. But if they have feelings which do not rise out of their interests, I think they ought not to be represented. What! Shall the unjust, the selfish, the unsocial feelings be represented? Shall the vices, the infirmities, the passions, of the people be represented? Government, sir, would be a monster; laws made to encourage virtue and maintain peace would have a preposterous tendency to subvert the authority and outrage the principles on which they were founded; besides, the feelings of the people are so variable and inconstant that our rulers should be chosen every day; people have one sort of feeling to-day, another to-morrow, and the voice of the representative must be incessantly changing in correspondence with these feelings. This would be making him a political weathercock.

The honorable gentleman from Duchess [Mr. Smith], who has so copiously declaimed against all declamation, has pointed his artillery against the rich and great. I am not interested in defining rich men; but what does he mean by telling us that the rich are vicious and intemperate? Will he presume to point out to us the class of men in which intemperance is not to be found? Is there less intemperance in feeding on beef than on turtle—or in drinking rum than wine? I think the gentleman does not reason from facts. If he will look round among the rich men of his acquaintance, I fancy he will find them as honest and virtuous as any class in the community. He says the rich are unfeeling; I believe they are less so than the poor, for it seems to me probable that those who are most occupied by their own cares and distresses have the least sympathy with the distresses of others. The sympathy of the poor is generally selfish, that of the rich a more disinterested emotion.

The gentleman further observes that ambition is peculiarly the vice of the wealthy. But have not all classes of men their objects of ambition? Will not a poor man contend for a constable's staff with as much assiduity and eagerness as a man of rank will aspire to the chief magistracy? The great offices in the State are beyond the view of the poor and ignorant man; he

will therefore contemplate an humbler office as the highest alluring object of ambition; he will look with equal envy on a successful competitor, and will equally sacrifice to the attainment of his wishes the duty he owes to his friends or to the public. But, says the gentleman, the rich will always be brought forward; they will exclusively enjoy the suffrages of the people. For my own part, I believe that, if two men of equal abilities set out together in life, one rich, the other of small income, the latter will generally take the lead in your Government. The rich are ever objects of envy; and this, more or less, operates as a bar to their advancement. What is the fact? Let us look around us; I might mention gentlemen in office who have not been advanced for their wealth; I might instance, in particular, the honorable gentleman who presides over this State, who was not promoted to the chief magistracy for his riches, but his virtue.

The gentleman, sensible of the weakness of this reasoning, is obliged to fortify it by having recourse to the phantom, aristocracy. I have heard much of this. I always considered it as the bugbear of the party. We are told that, in every country, there is a natural aristocracy, and that this aristocracy consists of the rich and the great; nay, the gentleman goes further, and ranks in this class of men the wise, the learned, and those eminent for their talents or great virtues. Does a man possess the confidence of his fellow-citizens for having done them important services? He is an aristocrat. Has he great integrity? Such a man will be greatly trusted; he is an aristocrat. Indeed, to determine that one is an aristocrat, we need only be assured he is a man of merit. But I hope we have many such. I hope, sir, we are all aristocrats. So sensible am I of that gentleman's talents, integrity, and virtue, that we might at once hail him the first of the nobles, the very prince of the Senate. But whom, in the name of common sense, will we have to represent us? Not the rich, for they are sheer aristocrats. Not the learned, the wise, the virtuous, for they are all aristocrats. Whom then? Why, those who are not virtuous; those who are not wise; those who are not learned;—these are the men to whom alone we can trust our liberties. He says, further, we ought not to choose these aristocrats, because the people will not have confidence in them; that is, the people will not have confidence in those who best deserve and most possess their confidence. He would have his

government composed of other classes of men; where will we find them? Why, he must go out into the highways, and pick up the rogue and the robber; he must go to the hedges and ditches, and bring in the poor, the blind, and the lame. As the gentleman has thus settled the definition of aristocracy, I trust that no man will think it a term of reproach; for who among us would not be wise? Who would not be virtuous? Who would not be above want? How, again, would he have us to guard against aristocracy? Clearly by doubling the representation, and sending twelve aristocrats instead of six. The truth is, in these republican governments, we know no such ideal distinctions. We are all equally aristocrats. Offices, emoluments, honors, are open to all.

Much has been said by the gentleman about corruption; he calculates that twenty-four may give the voice of Congress; that is, they will compose a bare majority of a bare quorum of both houses. He supposes here the most singular, and, I might add, the most improbable combination of events. First, there is to be a power in the Government which has the means, and whose interest it is to be corrupt. Next, twenty-four men are to compose the legislature; and these twenty-four, selected by their fellow-citizens as the most virtuous, are all, in violation of their oath and their real interests, to be corrupted. Then he supposes that the virtuous minority will be inattentive, regardless of their own honor and the good of their country, making no alarm, no struggle,— a whole people suffering the injury of a ruinous law, yet ignorant, inactive, and taking no measures to redress the grievance!

Let us take a view of the present Congress. The gentleman is satisfied with our present Federal Government on the score of corruption. Here he has confidence. Though each State may delegate seven, they generally send no more than three; consequently thirty-nine men may transact any business under the old Government, while the new legislature, which, in all probability, will be constantly full, will consist of ninety-one. But, say the gentlemen, our present Congress have not the same powers. I answer, they have the very same. Congress have the power of making war and peace, of levying money and raising men; they may involve us in a war at their pleasure; they may negotiate loans to any extent, and make unlimited demands upon the States.

Here the gentleman comes forward and says that the States are to carry these powers into execution; and they have the power of noncompliance. But is not every State bound to comply? What power have they to control Congress in the exercise of those rights which they have pledged themselves to support? It is true they have broken, in numerous instances, the compact by which they were obligated — and they may do it again; but will the gentlemen draw an argument of security from the facility of violating their faith? Suppose there should be a majority of creditor States under the present Government, might they not combine and compel us to observe the covenant by which we had bound ourselves?

We are told that this Constitution gives Congress the power over the purse and the sword. Sir, have not all good governments this power? Nay, does any one doubt that under the old Confederation Congress holds the purse and the sword? How many loans did they procure which we are bound to pay! How many men did they raise whom we are bound to maintain! How will gentlemen say that that body, which is indeed extremely small, can be more safely trusted than a much larger body possessed of the same authority? What is the ground of such entire confidence in the one — what the causes of so much jealousy of the other?

An honorable member from New York has viewed the subject of representation in a point of light which had escaped me, and which I think clear and conclusive. He says that the State of Delaware must have one; and, as that State will not probably increase for a long time, it will be the interest of the larger States to determine the ratio by what Delaware contains. The gentlemen in opposition say: Suppose Delaware contains fifty thousand, why not fix the ratio at sixty thousand? Clearly, because by this the other States will give up a sixth part of their interests. The members of Congress, also, from a more private motive, will be induced to augment the representation. The chance of their own re-election will increase with the number of their colleagues.

It has been further observed that the sense of the people is for a larger representation, and that this ought to govern us — that the people generally are of opinion that even our House of Assembly is too small. I very much doubt this fact. As far as

my observation has extended, I have found a very different sentiment prevail. It seems to be the predominant opinion of our State government, and I presume that the people have as much confidence in their Senate of twenty-four as in their Assembly of sixty-five. All these considerations have united to give my mind the most perfect conviction that the number specified in the Constitution is fully adequate to the present wants of the country, and that this number will be increased to the satisfaction of the most timid and jealous.

JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL

(1819–1891)

JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL'S remarkable versatility as a poet and critic was accompanied by a scarcely less remarkable fluency as a platform speaker and political orator. Both in time and subject-matter, his addresses cover a wide range. He became actively interested in politics during the Mexican War period, and remained so until his death. It is probable that by his first efforts in politics he contributed as much to defeat the Democratic party after the Mexican War as by his championship of the "Mugwump movement" he did to defeat the Republican party in 1884. Among his addresses none are more vigorous in thought and expression than those delivered at Cambridge in 1855, the year in which he succeeded Longfellow at Harvard. He was born at Cambridge, February 22d, 1819, and died there August 12th, 1891. He graduated at Harvard in 1838, and ten years later published the 'Biglow Papers,' which gave him, perhaps, his widest celebrity, though he may have preferred that his permanent reputation should rest on later and less humorous works. From 1857 to 1862 he was editor of the Atlantic Monthly and of the North American Review. In 1877 he was sent as Minister to Spain, and after serving until 1880 he was in that year appointed Minister to England. He had an active intellect, a wide range of reading, and a delightful faculty of humor. As a critic he is always entertaining, and never offensive, even when he challenges dissent — as he did with much boldness in attempting to dethrone Pope from his place among great English masters.

THE POETICAL AND THE PRACTICAL IN AMERICA

(Delivered at Cambridge, Friday Evening, February 16th, 1855)

WHETHER, as some philosophers assume, we possess only the fragments of a great cycle of knowledge in whose centre stood the primeval man in friendly relation with the powers of the universe, and build our hovels out of the ruins of our ancestral palace; or whether, according to the developing

(evolutionary) theory of others, we are rising gradually and have come up from an atom, instead of descending from an Adam, so that the proudest pedigree might run up to a barnacle or a zoöphyte at last,— these are questions that will keep for a good many centuries yet! Confining myself to what little we can learn from history, we find tribes rising slowly out of barbarism to a higher or lower point of culture and civility, and everywhere the poet also is found under one name or another, changing in certain outward respects, but essentially the same.

But however far we go back, we shall find this also — that the poet and the priest were united originally in the same person; which means that the poet was he who was conscious of the world of spirit as well as that of sense, and was the embassador of the gods to men. This was his highest function, and hence his name of seer.

I suppose the word "epic" originally meant nothing more than this, that the poet was the person who was the greatest master of speech. His were the *epea pteroenta*, the true "winged words" that could fly down the unexplored future and carry the names of ancestral heroes, of the brave, and wise, and good. It was thus that the poet could reward virtue, and by and by, as society grew more complex, could burn in the brand of shame. This is Homer's character of Demodocus in the eighth book of the 'Odyssey:' —

"Whom the Muse loved and gave the good and ill,"

the gift of conferring good or evil immortality. The first histories were in verse, and, sung as they were at feasts and gatherings of the people, they awoke in men the desire of fame, which is the first promoter of courage and self-trust, because it teaches men by degrees to appeal from the present to the future. We may fancy what the influence of the early epics was when they were recited to men who claimed the heroes celebrated in them for their ancestors, by what Bouchardon, the sculptor, said only two centuries ago: "When I read Homer, I feel as if I were twenty feet high." Nor have poets lost their power over the future in modern times. Dante lifts up by the hair the face of some petty traitor, the Smith and Brown of some provincial Italian town, lets the fire of his 'Inferno' glare upon it for a moment, and it is printed forever on the memory of mankind! The historians may

iron out the shoulders of Richard III. as smooth as they can, they will never get over the wrench that Shakespeare gave them.

The peculiarity of almost all early literature is that it seems to have a double meaning; that underneath its natural, we find ourselves continually seeing and suspecting a supernatural meaning. Even in the older epics, the characters seem to be only half historical and half typical. They appear as the Pilgrim Fathers do in twenty-second of December speeches at Plymouth. The names may be historical, but the attributes are ideal. The orator draws a portrait rather of what he thinks founders ought to have been, than a likeness which contemporaries would have recognized. Thus did the early poets endeavor to make reality out of appearances. For except a few typical men, in whom certain ideas get embodied, the generations of mankind are mere apparitions who come out of the dark for a purposeless moment, and enter the dark again after they have performed the nothing they came for.

The poet's gift, then, is that of a seer. He it is who discovers the truth as it exists in types and images; that is, the spiritual meaning, which abides forever under the sensual, and his instinct is to express himself also in types and images. But it was not only necessary that he himself should be delighted with the vision, but that he should interest his hearers with the faculty divine. Pure truth is not acceptable to the mental palate. It must be diluted with character and incident; it must be humanized in order to be attractive. If the bones of a mastodon be exhumed, a crowd will gather out of curiosity; but let the skeleton of a man be turned up, and what a difference in the expression of the features! Every bystander then creates his little drama, in which those whitened bones take flesh upon them and stalk as chief actor.

The poet is he who can best see or best say what is ideal, what belongs to the world of soul and of beauty. Whether he celebrates the brave and good man, or the gods, or the beautiful as it appears in man or nature, something of a religious character still clings to him. He may be unconscious of his mission; he may be false to it; but, in proportion as he is a great poet, he rises to the level of it more often. He does not always directly rebuke what is bad or base, but indirectly, by making us feel what delight there is in the good and the fair. If he

besiege evil, it is with such beautiful engines of war (as Plutarch tells us of Demetrius) that the besieged themselves are charmed with them. Whoever reads the great poets cannot but be made better by it, for they always introduce him to a higher society, to a greater style of manners and of thinking. Whoever learns to love what is beautiful is made incapable of the mean, and low, and bad. It is something to be thought of, that all the great poets have been good men. He who translates the divine into the vulgar, the spiritual into the sensual, is the reverse of a poet.

It seems to be thought that we have come upon the earth too late, that there has been a feast of imagination formerly, and all that is left for us is to steal the scraps. We hear that there is no poetry in railroads, steamboats, and telegraphs, and especially in Brother Jonathan. If this be true, so much the worse for him. But because he is a materialist, shall there be no more poets? When we have said that we live in a materialistic age, we have said something which meant more than we intended. If we say it in the way of blame, we have said a foolish thing, for probably one age is as good as another; and, at any rate, the worst is good enough company for us. The age of Shakespeare seems richer than our own, only because it was lucky enough to have such a pair of eyes as his to see it, and such a gift of speech as his to report it. Shakespeare did not sit down and cry for the water of Helicon to turn the wheels of his little private mill there at Bankside. He appears to have gone more quietly about his business than any playwright in London; to have drawn off what water power he wanted from the great prosy current of affairs that flows alike for all; and, in spite of all, to have ground for the public what grist they wanted, coarse or fine. And it seems a mere piece of luck that the smooth stream of his activity reflected with such ravishing clearness every changing mood of heaven and earth, every stick and stone, every dog and clown and courtier that stood upon its brink. It is a curious illustration of the friendly manner in which Shakespeare received everything that came along, of what a "present man" he was, that in the very same year the mulberry tree was brought into England he got one and planted it in his garden at Stratford.

It is perfectly true that this is a materialistic age, and for that reason we want our poets all the more. We find that every

generation contrives to catch its singing larks without the sky's falling. When the poet comes he always turns out to be the man who discovers that the passing moment is the inspired one, and that the secret of poetry is not to have lived in Homer's day, or Dante's, but to be alive now. To be alive now,—that is the great art and mystery. They are dead men who live in the past, and men yet unborn who live in the future. We are like Hans in luck, forever exchanging the burdensome good we have for something else, till at last we come home empty-handed. The people who find their own age prosaic are those who see only its costume. And that is what makes it prosaic that we have not faith enough in ourselves to think our own clothes good enough to be presented to posterity in. The artists seem to think that the court dress of posterity is that of Vandyke's time, or Cæsar's. I have seen the model of a statue of Sir Robert Peel—a statesman whose merit consisted in yielding gracefully to the present—in which the sculptor had done his best to travesty the real man into a make-believe Roman. At the period when England produced its greatest poets, we find exactly the reverse of this, and we are thankful to the man who made the monument of Lord Bacon that he had genius enough to copy every button of his dress, everything down to the rosettes on his shoes. Those men had faith even in their own shoe strings. Till Dante's time the Italian poets thought no language good enough to put their nothings into but Latin, and, indeed, a dead tongue was the best for dead thoughts; but Dante found the common speech of Florence, in which men bargained, and scolded, and made love, good enough for him, and out of the world around him made a poem such as no Roman ever sang.

We cannot get rid of our wonder, we who have brought down the wild lightning from writing fiery doom upon the walls of heaven, to be our errand boy and penny postman. In this day of newspapers and electric telegraphs, in which common sense and ridicule can magnetize a whole continent between dinner and tea, we say that such a phenomenon as Mahomet were impossible, and behold Joe Smith and the State of Deseret! Turning over the yellow leaves of the same copy of 'Webster on Witchcraft,' which Cotton Mather studied, I thought: "Well, that goblin is laid at last!" And while I mused, the tables were dancing and the chairs beating the devil's tattoo all over Christendom. I have a neighbor who dug down through tough strata

of a clay slate to a spring pointed out by a witch-hazel rod in the hands of a seventh son's seventh son, and the water is the sweeter to him for the wonder that is mixed with it. After all, it seems that our scientific gas, be it never so brilliant, is not equal to the dingy old Aladdin's lamp.

It is impossible for men to live in the world without some poetry of some sort or other. If they cannot get the best, they will get at some subterfuge for it. But there is as much poetry as ever in the world, if we only knew how to find it out, and as much imagination, perhaps, only that it takes a more prosaic direction. Every man who meets with misfortune, who is stripped of his material prosperity, finds that he has a little outlying mountain-farm of imagination, which did not appear in the schedule of his effects, on which his spirit is able to keep itself alive, though he never thought of it while he was fortunate. Job turns out to be a great poet as soon as his flocks and herds are taken away from him.

Perhaps our continent will begin to sing by and by as others have done. We have had the practical forced upon us by our condition. We have had a whole hemisphere to clear up and put to rights. And we are descended from men who were hardened and stiffened by a downright wrestle with necessity. There was no chance for poetry among the Puritans. And yet if any people have a right to imagination, it should be the descendants of those very Puritans. They had enough of it, or they could not have conceived the great epic they did, whose books are States, and which is written on this continent from Maine to California.

John Quincy Adams, making a speech at New Bedford, many years ago, reckoned the number of whaleships (if I remember rightly) that sailed out of that port, and, comparing it with some former period, took it as a type of American success. But, alas! it is with quite other oil that those far shining lamps of a nation's true glory which burn forever must be filled. It is not by any amount of material splendor or prosperity, but only by moral greatness, by ideas, by works of imagination, that a race can conquer the future. No voice comes to us from the once mighty Assyria but the hoot of the owl that nests amid her crumbling palaces. Of Carthage, whose merchant fleets once furled their sails in every port of the known world, nothing is left but the deeds of Hannibal. She lies dead on the shore of

her once subject sea, and the wind of the desert only flings its handfuls of burial sand upon her corse. A fog can blot Holland or Switzerland out of existence. But how large is the space occupied in the maps of the soul by little Athens or powerless Italy! They were great by the soul, and their vital force is as indestructible as the soul!

Till America has learned to love art, not as an amusement, not as the mere ornament of her cities, not as a superstition of what is *comme il faut* for a great nation, but for its harmonizing and ennobling energy, for its power of making men better by arousing in them a perception of their own instincts for what is beautiful and sacred and religious, and an eternal rebuke of the base and worldly, she will not have succeeded in that high sense which alone makes a nation out of a people, and raises it from a dead name to a living power. Were our little mother island sunk beneath the sea, or worse, were she conquered by Scythian barbarians, yet Shakespeare would be an immortal England, and would conquer countries, where the bones of her last sailor had kept their ghastly watch for ages in unhallowed ooze!

This lesson I learn from the past: that grace and goodness, the fair, the noble, and the true, will never cease out of the world till the God from whom they emanate ceases out of it; that the sacred duty and noble office of the poet is to reveal and justify them to men; that as long as the soul endures, endures also the theme of new and unexampled song; that while there is grace in grace, love in love, and beauty in beauty, God will still send poets to find them, and bear witness of them, and to hang their ideal portraitures in the gallery of memory. God with us is forever the mystical name of the hour that is passing. The lives of the great poets teach us that they were the men of their generation who felt most deeply the meaning of the present.

POPE AND HIS TIMES

(From a Lecture at Cambridge, Delivered February 6th, 1855)

THERE is nothing more curious, whether in the history of individual men or of nations, than the reactions which occur at more or less frequent intervals. The human mind, both in persons and societies, is like a pendulum, which, the moment it has reached the limit of its swing in one direction, goes inevitably back as far on the other side, and so on forever.

These reactions occur in everything, from the highest to the lowest, from religion to fashions of dress. The close crop and sober doublet of the Puritans were followed by the laces and periwigs of Charles II. The scarlet coats of our grandfathers have been displayed by as general a blackness as if the world had all gone into mourning. Tight sleeves alternate with loose, and the full-sailed expanses of Navarino have shrunk to those close-reefed phenomena, which, like Milton's Demogorgon, are the name of bonnet without its appearance.

English literature, for half a century from the Restoration, showed the marks both of reaction and of a kind of artistic vassalage to France. From the compulsory saintship and short hair of the Roundheads, the world rushed eagerly towards a little wickedness and a wilderness of wig. Charles II. brought back with him French manners, French morals, and French taste. The fondness of the English for foreign fashions had long been noted. It was a favorite butt of the satirists of Elizabeth's day. Everybody remembers what Portia says of the English lord: "How oddly he is suited! I think he bought his doublet in Italy, his round hose in France, his bonnet in Germany, and his behavior everywhere." . . .

The condition of the English mind at the beginning of the last century was one particularly fitted to be magnetized from across the channel. The loyalty of everybody, both in politics and religion, had been dislocated. A generation of materialists was to balance the overspiritualism of the Puritans. The other world had had its turn long enough, and now this world was to have its chance. There seems to have been a universal skepticism, and in its most dangerous form, that is, united with a universal pretense of conformity. There was an unbelief that did not believe even in itself. Dean Swift, who looked forward to a

Bishopric, could write a book whose moral, if it had any, was that one religion was about as good as another, and accepted a cure of souls when it was doubtful if he thought men had any souls to be saved, or, at any rate, that they were worth saving if they had. The answer which Pulci's Margutte makes to Morgante when he asks him if he believed in Christ or Mahomet, would have expressed well enough the creed of the majority of that generation: —

> "Margutte answered then, to tell thee truly,
> My faith in black's no greater than in azure;
> But I believe in capons, roast meat, bouilli,
> And above all in wine, and carnal pleasure."

It was impossible that anything truly great, great I mean on the moral and emotional, as well as the intellectual sides, could be produced in such a generation. But something intellectually great could be and was. The French mind, always stronger in the perceptive and analytic than in the imaginative faculty, loving precision, grace, and *finesse*, had brought wit and fancy and the elegant arts of society to the perfection almost of science. Its ideal in literature was to combine the appearance of carelessness and gaiety of thought with intellectual exactness of statement. Its influence, then, in English literature will appear chiefly in neatness and facility of expression, in point of epigrammatic compactness of phrase, and these in conveying conventional rather than universal experience, in speaking for good society rather than for man.

Thus far in English poetry we have found life represented by Chaucer, the real life of men and women; the ideal or interior life as it relates to this world, by Spenser; what may be called imaginative life in Shakespeare; the religious sentiment or interior life as it relates to the other world, by Milton. But everything aspires toward a rhythmical utterance of itself, and, accordingly, the intellect and life, as it relates to what we call the world, were waiting for their poet. They found or made a most apt one in Alexander Pope.

He stands for perfectness of intellectual expression, and it is a striking instance how much success and permanence of reputation depend upon conscientious and laborious finish, as well as upon natural endowments.

I confess that I come to the treatment of Pope with diffidence. I was brought up in the old superstition that he was the greatest poet that ever lived, and when I came to find that I had instincts of my own, and my mind was brought in contact with the apostles of a more esoteric doctrine of poetry, I felt that ardent desire for smashing the idols I had been brought up to worship, without any regard to their artistic beauty, which characterizes youthful zeal. What was it to me that Pope was a master of style? I felt, as Addison says in his Freeholder, in answering an argument in favor of the Pretender, because he could speak English, and George I. could not,—"that I do not wish to be tyrannized over in the best English that ever was spoken." There was a time when I could not read Pope, but disliked him by instinct, as old Roger Ascham seems to have felt about Italy when he says: "I was once in Italy myself, but I thank God my abode there was only nine days."

But Pope fills a very important place in the history of English poetry, and must be studied by every one who would come to a clear knowledge of it. I have since read over every line that Pope ever wrote, and every letter written by or to him, and that more than once. If I have not come to the conclusion that he is the greatest of poets, I believe that I am at least in a condition to allow him every merit that is fairly his. I have said that Pope, as a literary man, represents precision and grace of expression; but as a fact he represents something more, nothing less, namely, than one of those eternal controversies of taste which will last as long as the imagination and understanding divide men between them. It is not a matter to be settled by any amount of argument or demonstration. Men are born Popists or Wordsworthians, Lockists or Kantists, and there is nothing more to be said of the matter. We do not hear that the green spectacles persuaded the horse into thinking that shavings were grass.

That reader is happiest whose mind is broad enough to enjoy the natural school for its nature, and the artificial for its artificiality, provided they be only good of their kind. At any rate, we must allow that the man who can produce one perfect work is either a great genius or a very lucky one; as far as we who read are concerned, it is of secondary importance which. . . .

Personally, we know more about Pope than any of our poets. He kept no secret about himself. If he did not let the cat out

of the bag, he always contrived to give her tail a pinch so that we might know she was there. In spite of the savageness of his satires, his disposition seems to have been a truly amiable one, and his character as an author was as purely fictitious as his style. I think that there was very little real malice in him.

A great deal must be allowed to Pope,—for the age in which he lived, and not a little, I think, for the influence of Swift. In his own province he still stands unapproachably alone. If to be the greatest satirist of individual men, rather than of human nature, if to be the highest expression which the life of court and the ballroom has ever found in verse, if to have added more phrases to our language than any other but Shakespeare, if to have charmed four generations, make a man a great poet, then he is one. He was the chief founder of an artificial style of writing, which in his hand was living and powerful, because he used it to express artificial modes of thinking, and an artificial style of society. Measured by any high standard of imagination, he will be found wanting; tried by any test of wit, he is unrivaled.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK

(1834–)

THE address by Sir John Lubbock delivered before the Workingmen's College in London in 1887 gave occasion for a remarkable illustration of popular interest in subjects which have been supposed to challenge attention only from select audiences, «fit, though few.» The address was on books and reading, and Sir John Lubbock attempted to suggest a list of a hundred books likely to be most helpful to the general reader. The list was warmly discussed all over the English-speaking world. It gave occasion, not only for newspaper controversy and magazine essays, but for many «prize lists of best authors» contributed by magazine and newspaper readers, invited to compete for prizes by editors alive to the fact that, in the absence of a war or commercial panic, public interest had become capable of being excited over a literary topic. It is perhaps true that in one way or another Sir John Lubbock's address became the most influential, as it was certainly the most noted literary address delivered during the century. The books recommended by him were afterwards published in popular «libraries.» He was born at London, April 30th, 1834. A man of the highest cultivation, he has been active in many lines of scientific and literary work. As an archæologist he has published several noted works on the origin of civilization, but his best and most interesting scientific work has been done as a student of the life and customs of ants, bees, and wasps. He has been Vice-President of the Royal Society, President of the Linnean Society, Trustee of the British Museum, President of the Institute of Bankers, etc. Since 1880 he has represented the University of Oxford in Parliament.

THE HUNDRED BEST BOOKS

(An Address Delivered in 1887 before the Workingmen's College, London)

> "All round the room my silent servants wait,
> My friends in every season, bright and dim,
> Angels and Seraphim
> Come down and murmur to me, sweet and low,
> And spirits of the skies all come and go,
> Early and late." PROCTOR.

And yet too often they wait in vain. One reason for this is, I think, that people are overwhelmed by the crowd of books offered to them. In old days books were rare and dear. Now, on the contrary, it may be said with greater truth than ever that—

> "Words are things, and a small drop of ink,
> Falling like dew upon a thought, produces
> That which makes thousands, perhaps millions, think."

Our ancestors had a difficulty in procuring them. Our difficulty now is what to select. We must be careful what we read, and not, like the sailors of Ulysses, take bags of wind for sacks of treasure — not only lest we should even now fall into the error of the Greeks, and suppose that language and definitions can be instruments of investigation as well as of thought, but lest, as too often happens, we should waste time over trash. There are many books to which one may apply, in the sarcastic sense, the ambiguous remark said to have been made to an unfortunate author: "I will lose no time in reading your book."

There are, indeed, books and books, and there are books which, as Lamb said, are not books at all. It is wonderful how much innocent happiness we thoughtlessly throw away. An Eastern proverb says that calamities sent by heaven may be avoided, but from those we bring on ourselves there is no escape.

Many, I believe, are deterred from attempting what are called stiff books for fear they should not understand them; but there are few who need complain of the narrowness of their minds, if only they would do their best with them.

In reading, however, it is most important to select subjects in which one is interested. I remember years ago consulting

Mr. Darwin as to the selection of a course of study. He asked me what interested me most, and advised me to choose that subject. This, indeed, applies to the work of life generally.

I am sometimes disposed to think that the readers of the next generation will be, not our lawyers and doctors, shopkeepers and manufacturers, but the laborers and mechanics. Does not this seem natural? The former work mainly with their heads; when their daily duties are over, the brain is often exhausted, and of their leisure time much must be devoted to air and exercise. The laborer and mechanic, on the contrary, besides working often for much shorter hours, have in their work-time taken sufficient bodily exercise, and could therefore give any leisure they might have to reading and study. They have not done so as yet, it is true; but this has been for obvious reasons. Now, however, in the first place, they receive an excellent education in elementary schools, and in the second have more easy access to the best books.

Ruskin has observed that he does not wonder at what men suffer, but he often wonders at what they lose. We suffer much, no doubt, from the faults of others, but we lose much more by our own ignorance.

"If," says Sir John Herschel, "I were to pray for a taste which should stand me in stead under every variety of circumstances, and be a source of happiness and cheerfulness to me through life, and a shield against its ills, however things might go amiss and the world frown upon me, it would be a taste for reading. I speak of it, of course, only as a worldly advantage, and not in the slightest degree as superseding or derogating from the higher office and surer and stronger panoply of religious principles — but as a taste, and instrument, and a mode of pleasurable gratification. Give a man this taste, and the means of gratifying it, and you can hardly fail of making a happy man, unless, indeed, you put into his hands a most perverse selection of books."

It is one thing to own a library; it is quite another to use it wisely. I have often been astonished how little care people devote to the selection of what they read. Books, we know, are almost innumerable; our hours for reading are, alas! very few. And yet many people read almost by hazard. They will take any book they chance to find in a room at a friend's house; they will buy a novel at a railway stall if it has an attractive title;

indeed, I believe in some cases even the binding affects their choice. The selection is, no doubt, far from easy. I have often wished some one would recommend a list of a hundred good books. If we had such lists drawn up by a few good guides, they would be most useful. I have, indeed, sometimes heard it said that in reading every one must choose for himself, but this reminds me of the recommendation not to go into the water till you can swim.

In the absence of such lists, I have picked out the books most frequently mentioned with approval by those who have referred directly or indirectly to the pleasure of reading, and have ventured to include some which, though less frequently mentioned, are especial favorites of my own. Every one who looks at the list will wish to suggest other books, as indeed I should myself, but in that case the number would soon run up.

I have abstained, for obvious reasons, from mentioning works by living authors, though from many of them — Tennyson, Ruskin, and others — I have myself derived the keenest enjoyment; and I have omitted works on science, with one or two exceptions, because the subject is so progressive.

I feel that the attempt is over-bold, and I must beg for indulgence, while hoping for criticism; indeed, one object which I have had in view is to stimulate others more competent far than I am to give us the advantage of their opinions.

Moreover, I must repeat that I suggest these works rather as those which, as far as I have seen, have been most frequently recommended than as suggestions of my own, though I have slipped in a few of my own special favorites.

In any such selection much weight should, I think, be attached to the general verdict of mankind. There is a "struggle for existence" and a "survival of the fittest" among books, as well as among animals and plants. As Alonzo of Aragon said: "Age is a recommendation in four things — old wood to burn, old wine to drink, old friends to trust, and old books to read." Still, this cannot be accepted without important qualifications. The most recent books of history and science contain or ought to contain, the most accurate information and the most trustworthy conclusions. Moreover, while the books of other races and times have an interest from their very distance, it must be admitted that many will still more enjoy, and feel more at home with, those of our own century and people.

Yet the oldest books of the world are remarkable and interesting on account of their very age; and the works which have influenced the opinions or charmed the leisure hours of millions of men in distant times and far-away regions are well worth reading on that very account, even if to us they seem scarcely to deserve their reputation. It is true that to many such works are accessible only in translations; but translations, though they can never perhaps do justice to the original, may yet be admirable in themselves. The Bible itself, which must stand first in the list, is a conclusive case.

At the head of all non-Christian moralists I must place the 'Enchiridion' of Epictetus, certainly one of the noblest books in the whole of literature; it has, moreover, been admirably translated. With Epictetus, I think must come Marcus Aurelius. The 'Analects' of Confucius will, I believe, prove disappointing to most English readers, but the effect it has produced on the most numerous race of men constitutes in itself a peculiar interest. The 'Ethics' of Aristotle, perhaps, appear to some disadvantage from the very fact that they have so profoundly influenced our views of morality. The 'Koran,' like the 'Analects' of Confucius, will to most of us derive its principal interest from the effect it has exercised, and still exercises, on so many millions of our fellow-men. I doubt whether in any other respect it will seem to repay perusal, and to most persons probably certain extracts, not too numerous, would appear sufficient.

The writings of the Apostolic Fathers have been collected in one volume by Wake. It is but a small one, and though I must humbly confess that I was disappointed, they are perhaps all the more curious from the contrast they afford to those of the Apostles themselves. Of the later Fathers I have included only the 'Confessions of St. Augustine,' which Dr. Pusey selected for the commencement of the 'Library of the Fathers,' and which, as he observes, has "been translated again and again into almost every European language, and in all loved"; though Luther was of opinion that St. Augustine "wrote nothing to the purpose concerning faith." But then Luther was no great admirer of the Fathers. St. Jerome, he says, "writes alas! very coldly"; Chrysostom "digresses from the chief points"; St. Jerome is "very poor"; and, in fact, he says, "the more I read the books of the Fathers the more I find myself offended"; while Renan, in his interesting autobiography, compared theology to a Gothic cathedral, *elle a la grandeur, les vides immenses, et le peu de solidité.*

Among other devotional works most frequently recommended are Thomas à Kempis's 'Imitation of Christ'; Pascal's 'Pensées'; Spinoza's 'Tractatus Theologico-Politicus'; Butler's 'Analogy of Religion'; Jeremy Taylor's 'Holy Living and Dying'; Bunyan's 'Pilgrim's Progress'; and last, not least, Keble's beautiful 'Christian Year.'

Aristotle and Plato again stand at the head of another class. The 'Politics' of Aristotle, and Plato's 'Dialogues,' if not the whole, at any rate the 'Phædo,' the 'Apology, and the 'Republic,' will be read, of course, by all who wish to know anything of the history of human thought, though I am heretical enough to doubt whether the latter repays the minute and laborious study often devoted to it.

Aristotle being the father, if not the creator, of the modern scientific method, it has followed naturally — indeed, almost inevitably — that his principles have become part of our very intellectual being, so that they seem now almost self-evident, while his actual observations, though very remarkable, — as, for instance, when he observes that bees on one journey confine themselves to one kind of flower, — still have been in many cases superseded by others, carried on under more favorable conditions. We must not be ungrateful to the great master, because his lessons have taught us how to advance.

Plato, on the other hand (I say so with all respect) seems to me, in some cases, to play on words: his arguments are very able, very philosophical, often very noble; but not always conclusive; in a language differently constructed they might sometimes tell in exactly the opposite sense. If this method has proved less fruitful, if in metaphysics we have made but little advance, that very fact, in one point of view, leaves the 'Dialogues' of Socrates as instructive now as ever they were; while the problems with which they deal will always rouse our interest, as the calm and lofty spirit which inspires them must command our admiration. Of the 'Apology' and the 'Phædo' especially, it would be impossible to speak too gratefully.

I would also mention Demosthenes's 'De Coronâ,' which Lord Brougham pronounced the greatest oration of the greatest of orators; Lucretius; Plutarch's 'Lives'; Horace; and at least the 'De Officiis,' 'De Amicitiâ,' and 'De Senectute,' of Cicero.

The great epics of the world have always constituted one of the most popular branches of literature. Yet how few, comparatively, ever read Homer or Virgil after leaving school.

The 'Nibelungenlied,' our great Anglo-Saxon epic, is perhaps too much neglected, no doubt on account of its painful character. Brunhild and Kriemhild, indeed, are far from perfect, but we meet with few such "live" women in Greek or Roman literature. Nor must I omit to mention Sir T. Malory's 'Morte d'Arthur,' though I confess I do so mainly in deference to the judgment of others.

Among the Greek tragedians I include Æschylus, if not all his works, at any rate 'Prometheus,' perhaps the sublimest poem in Greek literature, and the 'Trilogy' (Mr. Symonds in his 'Greek Poets' speaks of the "unrivaled majesty" of the 'Agamemnon,' and Mark Pattison considered it "the grandest work of creative genius in the whole range of literature"); or, as Sir M. E. Grant Duff recommends, the 'Persæ'; Sophocles's 'Œdipus Tyrannus'; Euripides's 'Medea'; and Aristophanes's 'The Knights' and 'The Clouds'; unfortunately, as Schlegel says, probably even the greatest scholar does not understand half his jokes; and I think most modern readers will prefer our modern poets.

I should like, moreover, to say a word for Eastern poetry, such as portions of the 'Mahābhārata' and 'Rāmāyana' (too long, probably, to be read through, but of which Talboys Wheeler has given a most interesting epitome in the first two volumes of his 'History of India'); the 'Shah-nameh,' the work of the great Persian poet Firdusi; Kalidasa's 'Sakuntala,' and the 'Sheking,' the classical collection of ancient Chinese odes. Many, I know, will think I ought to have included Omar Khayyam.

In history we are beginning to feel that the vices and vicissitudes of kings and queens, the dates of battles and wars, are far less important than the development of human thought, the progress of art, of science, and of law, and the subject is on that very account even more interesting than ever. I will, however, only mention, and that rather from a literary than a historical point of view, Herodotus, Xenophon (the 'Anabasis'), Thucydides, and Tacitus ('Germania'); and of modern historians, Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall' ("the splendid bridge from the old world to the new"), Hume's 'History of England,' Carlyle's 'French Revolution,' Grote's 'History of Greece,' and Green's 'Short History of the English People.'

Science is so rapidly progressive that, though to many minds it is the most fruitful and interesting subject of all, I cannot here rest on that agreement which, rather than my own opinion, I take as the basis of my list. I will, therefore, only mention

Bacon's 'Novum Organum,' Mill's 'Logic,' and Darwin's 'Origin of Species'; in political economy, which some of our rulers do not now sufficiently value, Mill, and parts of Smith's 'Wealth of Nations,' for probably those who do not intend to make a special study of political economy would scarcely read the whole.

Among voyages and travels, perhaps those most frequently suggested are Cook's 'Voyages,' Humboldt's 'Travels,' and Darwin's 'Naturalist's Journal,' though I confess I should like to have added many more.

Mr. Bright not long ago specially recommended the less-known American poets, but he probably assumed that every one would have read Shakespeare, Milton ('Paradise Lost,' 'Lycidas,' 'Comus,' and minor poems), Chaucer, Dante, Spencer, Dryden, Scott, Wordsworth, Pope, Byron, and others, before embarking on more doubtful adventures.

Among other books most frequently recommended are Goldsmith's 'Vicar of Wakefield'; Swift's 'Gulliver's Travels'; Defoe's 'Robinson Crusoe'; 'The Arabian Nights'; 'Don Quixote'; Boswell's 'Life of Johnson'; White's 'Natural History of Selborne'; Burke's 'Select Works'; the Essays of Bacon, Addison, Hume, Montaigne, Macaulay, and Emerson; Carlyle's 'Past and Present'; Smiles's 'Self-Help'; and Goethe's 'Faust' and 'Autobiography.'

Nor can one go wrong in recommending Berkeley's 'Human Knowledge,' Descartes's 'Discours sur la Méthode,' Locke's 'Conduct of the Understanding,' Lewes's 'History of Philosophy,' while, in order to keep within the number one hundred, I can only mention Moliére and Sheridan among dramatists. Macaulay considered Marivaux's 'La Vie de Marianne' the best novel in any language, but my number is so nearly complete that I must content myself with English, and will suggest Thackeray ('Vanity Fair' and 'Pendennis'), Dickens ('Pickwick' and 'David Copperfield'), George Eliot ('Adam Bede' or 'The Mill on the Floss'), Kingsley ('Westward Ho!'), Lytton ('Last Days of Pompeii'), and last, not least, those of Scott, which indeed constitute a library in themselves, but which I must ask, in return for my trouble, to be allowed, as a special favor, to count as one.

To any lover of books, the very mention of these names brings back a crowd of delicious memories, grateful recollections of peaceful home hours after the labors and anxieties of the day. How thankful we ought to be for these inestimable blessings for this numberless host of friends who never weary, betray, or forsake us!

LIST OF ONE HUNDRED BOOKS

(Works by Living Authors Are Omitted)

The Bible; 'The Meditations of Marcus Aurelius'; 'Epictetus'; Aristotle's 'Ethics'; 'Analects' of Confucius; Saint-Hilaire's 'Le Bouddha et sa Religion'; Wake's 'Apostolic Fathers'; Thomas à Kempis's 'Imitation of Christ'; 'Confessions of St. Augustine' (Dr. Pusey); 'The Koran' (portions of); Spinoza's 'Tractatus Theologico-Politicus'; Comte's 'Catechism of Positive Philosophy'; Pascal's 'Pensées'; Butler's 'Analogy of Religion'; Taylor's 'Holy Living and Dying'; Bunyan's 'Pilgrim's Progress'; Keble's 'Christian Year.'

Plato's 'Dialogues'—at any rate, the 'Apology,' 'Crito,' and 'Phædo'; Xenophon's 'Memorabilia'; Aristotle's 'Politics'; Demosthenes's 'De Coronâ'; Cicero's 'De Officiis,' 'De Amicitiâ,' and 'De Senectute'; Plutarch's 'Lives'; Berkeley's 'Human Knowledge'; Descartes's 'Discours sur la Méthode'; Locke's 'On the Conduct of the Understanding.'

Homer; Hesiod; Virgil; 'Mâhâbharata' and 'Râmâyana' (Epitomized in Talboys Wheeler's 'History of India,' Vols. i. and ii.); 'The Shah-nameh'; 'The Nibelungenlied'; Malory's 'Morte d'Arthur.'

'The Sheking'; Kalidasa's 'Sakuntala, or the Lost Ring'; Æschylus's 'Prometheus' and 'Trilogy of Orestes'; Sophocles's 'Œdipus'; Euripides's 'Medea'; Aristophanes's 'The Knights' and 'The Clouds'; Horace.

Chaucer's 'Canterbury Tales' (perhaps in Morris's edition; or, if expurgated, in C. Clarke's, or Mrs. Haweis's); Shakespeare; Milton's 'Paradise Lost,' 'Lycidas,' 'Comus,' and the shorter poems; Dante's 'Divina Commedia'; Spenser's 'Faëry Queene'; Dryden's Poems; Scott's Poems; Wordsworth (Mr. Arnold's selection); Pope's 'Essay on Criticism,' 'Essay on Man,' 'Rape of the Lock'; Burns; Byron's 'Childe Harold'; Gray.

Herodotus; Xenophon's 'Anabasis' and 'Memorabilia'; Thucydides; Tacitus's 'Germania'; Livy; Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall'; Hume's 'History of England'; Grote's 'History of Greece'; Carlyle's 'French Revolution'; Green's 'Short History of England'; Lewes's 'History of Philosophy.'

'Arabian Nights'; Swift's 'Gulliver's Travels'; Defoe's 'Robinson Crusoe'; Goldsmith's 'Vicar of Wakefield'; Cervantes's 'Don Quixote'; Boswell's Life of Johnson'; Molière; Schiller's 'William Tell'; Sheridan's 'The Critic,' 'School for Scandal,' and 'The Rivals'; Carlyle's 'Past and Present.'

Bacon's 'Novum Organum'; Smith's 'Wealth of Nations' (part of); Mill's 'Political Economy'; Cook's 'Voyages'; Humboldt's 'Travels'; White's 'Natural History of Selborne'; Darwin's 'Origin of Species'; 'Naturalist's Voyage'; Mill's 'Logic'; Bacon's 'Essays'; Montaigne's 'Essays'; Hume's 'Essays'; Macaulay's 'Essays'; Addison's 'Essays'; Emerson's 'Essays'; Burke's 'Select Works'; Smiles's 'Self-Help'; Voltaire's 'Zadig' and 'Micromegas'; Goethe's 'Faust' and 'Autobiography'; Thackeray's 'Vanity Fair,' and 'Pendennis'; Dickens's; 'Pickwick' and 'David Copperfield'; Lytton's 'Last Days of Pompeii'; George Eliot's 'Adam Bede'; Kingsley's 'Westward Ho!'; Scott's 'Novels.'

MARTIN LUTHER

(1483–1546)

GERMANY conquered the Rome of the Cæsars only to be mastered by its superior education, as Republican Rome had been by the education of Greece. Slowly for nearly a thousand years the intellect of the Gothic tribes developed under Roman direction in literature, as well as in religion, until, in Luther's time, all Northern Europe was ripe for the issue against Italian control. The revival of classical learning, the fall of Constantinople, and the scattering of learned Greeks as far north as England, had given Northern Europe a confidence in its own intellectual powers it had never had before. Although in Germany itself Luther's work did not result in uniting all Germans against Rome, the movement he led was, as far as it affected politics, a race movement of the Gothic septs — of Teuton, Saxon, and Scandinavian — against Latin and Latinized Celt. While the rule shows frequent exceptions, it is the rule of the struggles in politics following Luther's revolt in Germany, that the countries of Southern and Western Europe, which were a part of the civilized Roman Empire in the time of Cicero, sided generally with the Pope, while the peoples who from the time of Cicero until that of Constantine were the most aggressive enemies of Roman power followed Luther and his successors. Whatever it was spiritually, the Reformation in its political effects was a revolt of Goth against Latin; and in Germany, England, Holland, Switzerland, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, the different denominations of Protestants constituted, as far as they ever showed solidarity, a Gothic Church representing the Teutonic race instinct against the Latin.

Luther's sermon, 'The Pith of Paul's Chief Doctrine,' preached on the first to the seventh verses of the fourth chapter of Galatians, embodies his doctrine of "salvation through faith." However this may antagonize other theological tenets, it is not then revolutionary in itself, nor has it ever been. But when Luther answered Charles V. at the Diet of Worms in 1521: "Here I stand; I cannot do otherwise; so help me God, Amen!" he had in him and back of him the forces which were to work out through the invention of printing, of paper, and of gunpowder, the breaking down at last of Teutonic feudalism and of that mediævalism which at its best and its worst was

Gothic and Teutonic, rather than Roman, Latin, or Classical. In this sense, Luther was as much a pioneer of American civilization as was the Latin "Romanist," Columbus himself. But Romanist and Protestant alike "builded better than they knew." Luther had little use for Puritans, and still less for Democrats or Republicans in the modern sense. When the German common people, rudely and barbarously oppressed, attempted, in rude and barbarous ways, to liberate themselves, he was as much in favor of putting them down with the "mailed hand" as either the Emperor or the Pope could have been. That is merely another way of saying, however, that he belonged to his own generation. It is not given to any man in any generation to be "everlastingly right." But if, in attempting to achieve the right, he be brave enough to stake everything upon it, he cannot fail of his own share of such greatness as Luther reached standing alone against the world at Worms, and achieving immortality in his "So help me God, Amen!"

W. V. B.

ADDRESS TO THE DIET AT WORMS

(Delivered April 18th, 1521)

[" The princes having taken their seats," says D'Aubigné, "though not without some difficulty, for many of their places had been occupied, and the monk of Wittenberg, finding himself again standing before Charles V., the Chancellor of Treves began by saying: —

"'Martin Luther, yesterday you begged for delay that has now expired. Assuredly it ought not to have been conceded, as every man, and especially you, who are so great and learned a doctor in the Holy Scriptures, should always be ready to answer any questions touching his faith. . . . Now, therefore, reply to the question put by his Majesty, who has behaved to you with so much mildness. Will you defend your books as a whole, or are you ready to disavow some of them?' It was to the question thus put that Luther replied: "—]

Most Serene Emperor, Illustrious Princes, Gracious Lords: —

In obedience to your commands given me yesterday, I stand here, beseeching you, as God is merciful, so to deign mercifully to listen to this cause, which is, as I believe, the cause of justice and of truth. And if through inexperience I should fail to apply to any his proper title, or offend in any way against the manners of courts, I entreat you to pardon me as one not conversant with courts, but rather with the cells of monks, and claiming no other merit than that of having spoken and written

with that simplicity of mind which regards nothing but the glory of God and the pure instruction of the people of Christ.

Two questions have been proposed to me: Whether I acknowledge the books which are published in my name, and whether I am determined to defend or disposed to recall them. To the first of these I have given a direct answer, in which I shall ever persist that those books are mine and published by me, except so far as they may have been altered or interpolated by the craft or officiousness of rivals. To the other I am now about to reply; and I must first entreat your Majesty and your Highnesses to deign to consider that my books are not all of the same description. For there are some in which I have treated the piety of faith and morals with simplicity so evangelical that my very adversaries confess them to be profitable and harmless and deserving the perusal of a Christian. Even the Pope's bull, fierce and cruel as it is, admits some of my books to be innocent, though even these, with a monstrous perversity of judgment, it includes in the same sentence. If, then, I should think of retracting these, should I not stand alone in my condemnation of that truth which is acknowledged by the unanimous confession of all, whether friends or foes?

The second species of my publications is that in which I have inveighed against the papacy and the doctrine of the papists, as of men who by their iniquitous tenets and examples have desolated the Christian world, both with spiritual and temporal calamities. No man can deny or dissemble this. The sufferings and complaints of all mankind are my witnesses, that, through the laws of the Pope and the doctrines of men, the consciences of the faithful have been ensnared, tortured, and torn in pieces, while, at the same time, their property and substance have been devoured by an incredible tyranny, and are still devoured without end and by degrading means, and that too, most of all, in this noble nation of Germany. Yet it is with them a perpetual statute, that the laws and doctrines of the Pope be held erroneous and reprobate when they are contrary to the Gospel and the opinions of the Fathers.

If, then, I shall retract these books, I shall do no other than add strength to tyranny and throw open doors to this great impiety, which will then stride forth more widely and licentiously than it has dared hitherto; so that the reign of iniquity will proceed with entire impunity, and, notwithstanding its intolerable

oppression upon the suffering vulgar, be still further fortified and established; especially when it shall be proclaimed that I have been driven to this act by the authority of your serene Majesty and the whole Roman Empire. What a cloak, blessed Lord, should I then become for wickedness and despotism!

In a third description of my writings are those which I have published against individuals, against the defenders of the Roman tyranny and the subverters of the piety taught by men. Against these I do freely confess that I have written with more bitterness than was becoming either my religion or my profession; for, indeed, I lay no claim to any especial sanctity, and argue not respecting my own life, but respecting the doctrine of Christ. Yet even these writings it is impossible for me to retract, seeing that through such retraction despotism and impiety would reign under my patronage, and rage with more than their former ferocity against the people of God.

Yet since I am but man and not God, it would not become me to go further in defense of my tracts than my Lord Jesus went in defense of his doctrine; who, when he was interrogated before Annas, and received a blow from one of the officers, answered: "If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil; but if well, why smitest thou me?" If then the Lord himself, who knew his own infallibility, did not disdain to require arguments against his doctrine even from a person of low condition, how much rather ought I, who am the dregs of the earth and the very slave of error, to inquire and search if there be any to bear witness against my doctrine! Wherefore, I entreat you, by the mercies of God, that if there be any one of any condition who has that ability, let him overpower me by the sacred writings, prophetical and evangelical. And for my own part, as soon as I shall be better instructed I will retract my errors and be the first to cast my books into the flames.

It must now, I think, be manifest that I have sufficiently examined and weighed, not only the dangers, but the parties and dissensions excited in the world by means of my doctrine, of which I was yesterday so gravely admonished. But I must avow that to me it is of all others the most delightful spectacle to see parties and dissensions growing up on account of the word of God, for such is the progress of God's word, such its ends and object. "Think not I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at

variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; and a man's foes shall be those of his own household."

Moreover we should reflect that our God is wonderful and terrible in his counsels; so that his work, which is now the object of so much solicitude, if we should found it in the condemnation of the word of God, may be turned by his providence into a deluge of intolerable calamity; and the reign of this young and excellent prince (in whom is our hope after God), not only should begin, but should continue and close under the most glowing auspices.

I could show more abundantly by reference to scriptural examples — to those of Pharaoh, the King of Babylon, the kings of Israel — that they have brought about their own destruction by those very counsels of worldly wisdom, which seemed to promise them peace and stability. For it is he who taketh the wise in their craftiness and removeth the mountains, and they know not, and overturneth them in his anger. So that it is the work of God to fear God. Yet I say not these things as if the great personages here present stood at all in need of my admonitions, but only because it was a service which I owed to my native Germany, and it was my duty to discharge it. And thus I commend myself to your serene Majesty and all the princes, humbly beseeching you not to allow the malice of my enemies to render me odious to you without a cause. I have done.

[«Having delivered this address in German,» says Doctor Waddington, «Luther was commanded to recite it in Latin. For a moment he hesitated; his breath was exhausted, and he was oppressed by the heat and throng of the surrounding multitude. One of the Saxon courtiers even advised him to excuse himself from obedience; but he presently collected his powers again, and repeated his speech with few variations and equal animation in the other language. His tone was that of supplication rather than remonstrance, and there was something of diffidence in his manner. . . . No sooner had he ceased than he was reminded, in a tone of reproach, that they were not assembled to discuss matters which had long ago been decided by councils, but that a simple answer was required of him to a simple question — whether he would retract or not. Then Luther continued:»—]

Since your most serene Majesty and the princes require a simple answer, I will give it thus: Unless I shall be convinced by proofs from Scripture or by evident reason,— for I believe neither in Popes nor councils, since they have frequently both

erred and contradicted themselves,— I cannot choose but adhere to the word of God, which has possession of my conscience; nor can I possibly, nor will I ever make any recantation, since it is neither safe nor honest to act contrary to conscience! Here I stand; I cannot do otherwise; so help me God! Amen.*

«THE PITH OF PAUL'S CHIEF DOCTRINE»

(A Sermon Preached on Galatians iv. 1–7)

[«Now I say that the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all; but is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father. Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the elements of the world: but when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father. Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ.»— Gal. iv. 1–7.]

This text touches the very pith of Paul's chief doctrine. The cause why it is well understood but by few, is, not that it is so obscure and difficult, but because there is so little knowledge of faith left in the world; without which it is not possible to understand Paul, who everywhere treats of faith with such earnestness and force. I must, therefore, speak in such a manner that this text will appear plain; and that I may more conveniently illustrate it, I will speak a few words by way of preface.

First, therefore, we must understand the doctrine in which good works are set forth, far different from that which treats of justification; as there is a great difference between the substance and its working; between man and his work. Justification pertains to man, and not to works; for man is either justified and saved, or judged and condemned, and not works. Neither is it a controversy among the godly, that man is not justified by works, but righteousness must come from some other source than from his own works: for Moses, writing of Abel, says: «The Lord had respect unto Abel, and to his offering.» First he had respect to Abel himself, then to his offering; because Abel was

* This is the address, translated in full by Dr. George Waddington, with his version corrected by that of D'Aubigné.

first counted righteous and acceptable to God, and then for his sake his offering was accepted also, and not he because of his offering. Again, God had no respect to Cain, and therefore neither to his offering: therefore thou seest that regard is had first to the worker, then to the work.

From this it is plainly gathered that no work can be acceptable to God, unless he which worketh it was first accepted by him: and again, that no work is disallowed of him unless the author thereof be disallowed before. I think these remarks will be sufficient concerning this matter at present, by which it is easy to understand that there are two sorts of works, those before justification, and those after it; and that these last are good works, indeed, but the former only appear to be good. Hereof cometh such disagreement between God and those counterfeit holy ones; for this cause nature and reason rise and rage against the Holy Ghost; this is that of which almost the whole Scripture treats. The Lord in his word defines all works that go before justification to be evil and of no importance, and requires that man before all things be justified. Again, he pronounces all men which are unregenerate and have that nature which they received of their parents unchanged, to be unrighteous and wicked, according to that saying: "All men are liars," that is, unable to perform their duty, and to do those things which they ought to do; and "Every imagination of the thoughts of his heart are only evil continually"; whereby he is able to do nothing that is good, for the fountain of his actions, which is his heart, is corrupted. If he do works which outwardly seem good, they are no better than the offering of Cain.

Here again comes forth reason, our reverend mistress, seeming to be marvelously wise, but who, indeed, is unwise and blind, gainsaying her God, and reproving him of lying; being furnished with her follies and feeble honor, to wit, the light of nature, free will, the strength of nature; also with the books of the heathen and the doctrines of men, contending that the works of a man not justified are good works, and not like those of Cain, yea, and so good that he that worketh them is justified by them; that God will have respect, first to the works, then to the worker. Such doctrine now bears the sway everywhere in schools, colleges, monasteries, wherein no other saints than Cain was, have rule and authority. Now from this error comes another: they which attribute so much to works, and do not accordingly esteem

the worker and sound justification, go so far that they ascribe all merit and righteousness to works done before justification, making no account of faith, alleging that which James saith, that without works faith is dead. This sentence of the Apostle they do not rightly understand; making but little account of faith, they always stick to works, whereby they think to merit exceedingly, and are persuaded that for their work's sake they shall obtain the favor of God: by this means they continually disagree with God, showing themselves to be the posterity of Cain. God hath respect unto man, these unto the works of man; God alloweth the work for the sake of him that worketh, these require that for the work's sake the worker may be crowned.

But here, perhaps, thou wilt say: What is needful to be done? By what means shall I become righteous and acceptable to God? How shall I attain to this perfect justification? The Gospel answers, teaching that it is necessary that thou hear Christ, and repose thyself wholly on him, denying thyself and distrusting thine own strength; by this means thou shalt be changed from Cain to Abel, and being thyself acceptable, shalt offer acceptable gifts to the Lord. It is faith that justifies thee. Thou being endued therewith, the Lord remitteth all thy sins by the mediation of Christ his Son, in whom this faith believeth and trusteth. Moreover, he giveth unto such a faith his Spirit, which changes the man and makes him anew, giving him another reason and another will. Such a one worketh nothing but good works. Wherefore nothing is required unto justification but to hear Jesus Christ our Savior and to believe in him. Howbeit these are not the works of nature, but of grace.

He, therefore, that endeavors to attain to these things by works, shutteth the way to the Gospel, to faith, grace, Christ, God, and all things that help unto salvation. Again, nothing is necessary in order to accomplish good works but justification; and he that hath attained it, performs good works and not any other. Hereof it sufficiently appears that the beginning, the things following, and the order of man's salvation are after this sort; first of all it is required that thou hear the word of God; next that thou believe; then that thou work; and so at last become saved and happy. He that changes this order, without doubt, is not of God. Paul also describes this, saying: "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How, then, shall they call on him in whom they have not believed?

and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent?"

Christ teaches us to pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers into his harvest; that is, sincere preachers. When we hear these preach the true word of God, we may believe; which faith justifies a man, and makes him godly indeed, so that he now calls upon God in the spirit of holiness, and works nothing but that which is good, and thus becomes a saved man. Thus he that believeth shall be saved; but he that worketh without faith is condemned; as Christ saith, he that doth not believe shall be condemned, from which no works shall deliver him. Some say, I will now endeavor to become honest. It is meet surely that we study to lead an honest life and to do good works. But if one ask them how we may apply ourselves unto honesty, and by what means we may attain it, they answer, that we must fast, pray, frequent temples, avoid sins, etc. Whereby one becomes a Charterhouse monk, another chooses some other order of monks, and another is consecrated a priest: some torment their flesh by wearing haircloth, others scourge their bodies with whips, others afflict themselves in a different manner; but these are of Cain's progeny, and their works are no better than his, for they continue the same that they were before, ungodly, and without justification. There is a change made of outward works only, of apparel, of place, etc.

They scarce think of faith, they presume only on such works as seem good to themselves, thinking by them to get to heaven. But Christ said: "Enter in at the strait gate, for I say unto you, many seek to enter in, and cannot." Why is this? because they know not what this narrow gate is; for it is faith, which altogether annihilates or makes a man appear as nothing in his own eyes, and requires him not to trust in his own works, but to depend upon the grace of God, and be prepared to leave and suffer all things. Those holy ones of Cain's progeny think their good works are the narrow gate; and are not, therefore, extenuated or made less, whereby they might enter.

When we begin to preach of faith to those that believe altogether in works, they laugh and hiss at us, and say: Dost thou count us as Turks and heathen, whom it behooves now first to learn faith? is there such a company of priests, monks, and nuns, and is not faith known? who knoweth not what he ought to

believe? even sinners know that. Being after this sort animated and stirred up, they think themselves abundantly endued with faith, and that the rest is now to be finished and made perfect by works. They make so small and slender account of faith, because they are ignorant of what faith is, and that it alone doth justify. They call it faith, believing those things which they have heard of Christ; this kind of faith the devils also have, and yet they are not justified. But this ought rather to be called an opinion of men. To believe those things to be true which are preached of Christ is not sufficient to constitute thee a Christian, but thou must not doubt that thou art of the number of them unto whom all the benefits of Christ are given and exhibited; which he that believes must plainly confess, that he is holy, godly, righteous, the son of God, and certain of salvation; and that by no merit of his own, but by the mere mercy of God poured forth upon him for Christ's sake: which he believes to be so rich and plentiful, as indeed it is, that although he be, as it were, drowned in sin, he is notwithstanding made holy, and become the son of God.

Wherefore, take heed that thou nothing doubt that thou art the son of God, and therefore made righteous by his grace; let all fear and care be done away. However, thou must fear and tremble that thou mayest persevere in this way unto the end; but thou must not do this as though it consisted in thy own strength, for righteousness and salvation are of grace, whereunto only thou must trust. But when thou knowest that it is of grace alone, and that thy faith also is the gift of God, thou shalt have cause to fear, lest some temptation violently move thee from this faith.

Every one by faith is certain of this salvation; but we ought to have care and fear that we stand and persevere, trusting in the Lord, and not in our own strength. When those of the race of Cain hear faith treated of in this manner, they marvel at our madness, as it seems to them. God turn us from this way, say they, that we should affirm ourselves holy and godly; far be this arrogance and rashness from us: we are miserable sinners; we should be mad, if we should arrogate holiness to ourselves. Thus they mock at true faith, and count such doctrine as this execrable error; and thus try to extinguish the Gospel. These are they that deny the faith of Christ, and persecute it throughout the whole world; of whom Paul speaks: "In the latter times

many shall depart from the faith," etc., for we see by these means that true faith lies everywhere oppressed; it is not preached, but commonly disallowed and condemned.

The Pope, bishops, colleges, monasteries, and universities have more than five hundred years persecuted it with one mind and consent most obstinately, which has been the means of driving many to hell. If any object against the admiration, or rather the mad senselessness of these men, if we count ourselves even holy, trusting the goodness of God to justify us, or as David prayed: "Preserve thou me, O Lord, for I am holy," or as Paul saith: "The spirit of God beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God," they answer that the prophet and apostle would not teach us in these words, or give us an example which we should follow, but that they, being particularly and specially enlightened, received such revelation of themselves. In this way they misrepresent the Scripture, which affirms that they are holy, saying that such doctrine is not written for us, but that it is rather peculiar miracles, which do not belong to all. This forged imagination we account of as having come from their sickly brain. Again, they believe that they shall be made righteous and holy by their own works, and that because of them God will give them salvation and eternal blessedness.

In the opinion of these men it is a Christian duty to think that we shall be righteous and sacred because of our works; but to believe that these things are given by the grace of God, they condemn as heretical, attributing that to their own works which they do not attribute to the grace of God. They that are endued with true faith, and rest upon the grace of the Lord, rejoice with holy joy and apply themselves with pleasure to good works, not such as those of Cain's progeny do, as feigned prayers, fasting, base and filthy apparel, and such like trifles, but to true and good works whereby their neighbors are profited.

Perhaps some godly man may think, If the matter be so, and our works do not save us, to what end are so many precepts given us, and why doth God require that they be obeyed? The present text of the Apostle will give a solution of this question, and upon this occasion we will give an exposition thereof. The Galatians being taught of Paul the faith of Christ, but afterward seduced by false apostles, thought that our salvation must be finished and made perfect by the works of the law; and that faith alone doth not suffice. These Paul calls back again from

works unto faith with great diligence, plainly proving that the works of the law which go before faith make us only servants, and are of no importance toward godliness and salvation; but that faith makes us the sons of God, and from thence good works without constraint forthwith plentifully flow.

But here we must observe the words of the Apostle; he calls him a servant that is occupied in works without faith, of which we have already treated at large; but he calls him a son which is righteous by faith alone. The reason is this, although the servant apply himself to good works, yet he does it not with the same mind as doth the son; that is, with a mind free, willing and certain that the inheritance and all the good things of the Father are his; but does it as he that is hired in another man's house, who hopes not that the inheritance shall come to him. The works, indeed, of the son and the servant are alike, and almost the same in outward appearance; but their minds differ exceedingly, as Christ saith: "The servant abideth not in the house forever, but the son abideth ever."

Those of Cain's progeny want the faith of sons, which they confess themselves, for they think it most absurd, and wicked arrogancy, to affirm themselves to be the sons of God, and holy; therefore as they believe, even so are they counted before God: they neither become holy nor the sons of God, nevertheless are they exercised with the works of the law; wherefore they are and remain servants forever. They receive no reward except temporal things, such as quietness of life, abundance of goods, dignity, honor, etc., which we see to be common among the followers of popish religion. But this is their reward, for they are servants, and not sons; wherefore in death they shall be separated from all good things, neither shall any portion of the eternal inheritance be theirs who in this life would believe nothing thereof. We perceive, therefore, that servants and sons are not unlike in works, but in mind and faith they have no resemblance.

The Apostle endeavors here to prove that the law with all the works thereof makes us but mere servants, if we have not faith in Christ; for this alone makes us sons of God. It is the word of grace followed by the Holy Ghost, as is shown in many places, where we read of the Holy Ghost falling on Cornelius and his family while hearing the preaching of Peter. Paul teaches that no man is justified before God by the works of the law; for sin

only cometh by the law. He that trusts in works, condemns faith as the most pernicious arrogancy and error of all others. Here thou seest plainly that such a man is not righteous, being destitute of that faith and belief which is necessary to make him acceptable before God and his Son; yea, he is an enemy to this faith, and therefore to righteousness also. Thus it is easy to understand that which Paul saith, that no man is justified before God by the works of the law.

The worker must be justified before God, before he can work any good thing. Men judge the worker by the works; God judges the works by the worker. The first precept requires us to acknowledge and worship one God, that is, to trust him alone, which is the true faith whereby we become the sons of God. Thou canst not be delivered from the evil of unbelief by thine own power, nor by the power of the law; wherefore all thy works which thou doest to satisfy the law can be nothing but works of the law; of far less importance than to be able to justify thee before God, who counteth them righteous only who truly believe in him; for they that acknowledge him the true God are his sons, and do truly fulfill the law. If thou shouldst even kill thyself by working, thy heart cannot obtain this faith thereby, for thy works are even a hindrance to it, and cause thee to persecute it.

He that studieth to fulfill the law without faith is afflicted for the devil's sake, and continues a persecutor, both of faith and the law, until he come to himself and cease to trust in his own works; he then gives glory to God who justifies the ungodly, and acknowledges himself to be nothing, and sighs for the grace of God, of which he knows that he has need. Faith and grace now fill his empty mind, and satisfy his hunger; then follow works which are truly good; neither are they works of the law, but of the Spirit, of faith and grace; they are called in the Scripture the works of God which he worketh in us.

Whatsoever we do of our own power and strength, that which is not wrought in us by his grace, without doubt is a work of the law, and avails nothing toward justification; but is displeasing to God, because of the unbelief wherein it is done. He that trusts in works does nothing freely and with a willing mind; he would do no good work at all if he were not compelled by the fear of hell, or allured by the hope of present good. Whereby it is plainly seen that they strive only for gain, or are moved

with fear, showing that they rather hate the law from their hearts, and had rather there were no law at all. An evil heart can do nothing that is good. This evil propensity of the heart, and unwillingness to do good, the law betrays, when it teaches that God does not esteem the works of the hand, but those of the heart.

Thus sin is known by the law, as Paul teaches; for we learn thereby that our affections are not placed on that which is good. This ought to teach us not to trust in ourselves, but to long after the grace of God, whereby the evil of the heart may be taken away, and we become ready to do good works, and love the law voluntarily; not for fear of any punishment, but for the love of righteousness. By this means one is made of a servant a son; of a slave an heir.

LORD LYNDHURST

(1772–1863)

JOHN SINGLETON COPLEY, Baron Lyndhurst and Lord Chancellor of England, was born at Boston, Massachusetts, in 1772. He was the son of the Boston painter, Copley, who settled in London a few years before the rebellion of the American colonies. The future Lord Lyndhurst was educated at Cambridge. After beginning the practice of law, he showed such marked ability as to attract the attention of Castlereagh and other Tory leaders, who converted him from his "Jacobin" theories, elected him to Parliament, made him Solicitor-General, Attorney-General, and in 1827 Lord Chancellor with the title of Baron Lyndhurst. He was Chancellor during four Tory administrations, from 1827 to 1846, holding that office for the last time in the Peel administration. In 1853 and 1854 his speeches on Russia and the Crimean War attracted the attention of Europe, and sometimes caused great excitement. He continued to take an interest in public affairs until after his eightieth year. He died October 12th, 1863.

RUSSIA AND THE CRIMEAN WAR

(From a Speech in the House of Lords, June 19th, 1854)

FROM the earliest period, from the time of the Empress Catherine down to the present day, Russia has considered Turkey as her destined prey. Every war between these powers has ended in the steady advance of Russia towards the accomplishment of her purpose, and we now know, from what has lately come to light, that she considers the victim to be almost within her grasp, and it is evident she will persevere with the constancy habitual to her in endeavors to seize and secure it. But, my lords, if the situation of Russia is to undergo no change at the termination of the present contest, what will be her actual position with respect to Turkey? I do not wish upon this point that you should rely upon any opinion or statement of mine, but will refer to an authority above all exception, that of Count Nesselrode himself.

Some time after the conclusion of the treaty of Adrianople, Count Nesselrode wrote to the Grand Duke Constantine, at Warsaw, to give an account of the particulars of that treaty, and of the relative situation of Russia and Turkey in consequence of it. A reference to that despatch will place before you in a striking manner the future position of Turkey if the *status quo* should be adopted. He expresses himself in these terms:—

"The Turkish monarchy is reduced to such a state as to exist only under the protection of Russia, and must comply in future with her wishes."

Then, adverting to the Principalities, he says:—

"The possession of these Principalities is of the less importance to us as, without maintaining troops there, which would be attended with considerable expense, we shall dispose of them at our pleasure, as well during peace as in time of war. We shall hold the keys of a position from which it will be easy to keep the Turkish Government in check, and the Sultan will feel that any attempt to brave us again must end in his certain ruin."

If this description be correct (and who can question its accuracy?) Turkey will thus be left at the mercy of Russia, whenever the state of Europe shall be such as to enable that power to avail herself of the advantage of her position, either for further encroachment or for the attainment of the ultimate object of her ambition—the entire subjugation of the European dominions of the Sultan. In what manner Russia is likely to act under such circumstances, I might, perhaps, safely leave your lordships to conclude, and certainly will not trouble you with any observations of my own respecting it, but refer you, as I have before done, to approved Russian authority—to that of Prince Lieven, for many years the representative of Russia at this court. In answer to a letter from Count Nesselrode, who had consulted him by command of the Emperor upon his projected attack upon Turkey, he expresses himself thus:—

"Our policy must be to maintain a reserved and prudent attitude until the moment arrives for Russia to vindicate her rights, and for the rapid action which she will be obliged to adopt. The war ought to take Europe by surprise. Our movements must be prompt, so that the other powers should find it impossible to be prepared for the blow that we are about to strike."

But Prince Lieven was one only of the persons consulted upon this occasion. The Emperor was desirous of knowing what opposition he was likely to meet with from the other powers individually, and what chance there was of a combination against him should he persevere in the execution of his design. The most detailed, and at the same time the most able, of the secret despatches transmitted to St. Petersburg upon the occasion was from Count Pozzo di Borgo, an adopted Russian, not an over-scrupulous, but a very keen and subtle diplomatist. He was intimately acquainted with this country and its policy, and was at that time the representative of Russia at Paris.

This paper cannot be read at the present time without a feeling of curiosity and deep interest. He adverts to the different powers in succession, beginning with this country: —

"England," he says, "has recovered from her commercial and financial crisis, and is in a condition to oppose us, and possibly may take that course. She may, in that event, do us considerable injury, but not of such a nature as to be wholly irremediable. She cannot, however, alone obstruct our designs or oppose the march of our armies."

His conclusion, therefore, is that the single opposition of this country could not stand in the way of the accomplishment of the Emperor's designs.

He then comes to France, and, after some curious and amusing comments upon Monsieur de Villele, the minister of that country, considers what would be the probable effect of the union of France and England in opposition to the projected enterprise. Whatever, he says, can be done by a superior naval force can be effected by England alone; the addition, therefore, of the maritime means of France will not be material; and as to her military power, she will be prevented from using it with any effect against us by reason of her geographical, moral, and political position. "Where," he observes, "is she to find a field of battle to oppose us; and," he adds, with an expression of triumph, "her armies well know what they have to expect if they come in collision with ours." What is to be the result of that collision at the present day must soon appear, and may, and I trust will, disappoint the confident anticipations of the Russian diplomatist.

Having thus disposed of England and France, he proceeds next to consider whether anything is to be apprehended from

Austria. Prince Metternich, that experienced, sagacious, and clear-sighted statesman, had endeavored, but without success, to awaken attention to the designs of Russia, and to form some sort of union against her. The attempt had excited the strongest feeling of resentment and indignation against that eminent person. Accordingly his policy was decried, his schemes ridiculed, and the power of Austria treated with contempt. One short sentence disposed of the whole: "To every country," said the Russian diplomatist, "war is a calamity; to Austria it would be certain ruin." Thus far then, according to this statement, there appeared to be no serious impediment to the aggressive designs of Russia.

I hear it whispered near me: You have forgotten Prussia. Far from it! I have reserved her as a pattern of constancy in political connection, and which would be most praiseworthy in connections of a different description. My noble friend opposite must possess some powerful attractive force to have torn asunder, or dissolved the strong cohesion between these two powers, Russia and Prussia. Read what Pozzo di Borgo says of Prussia. With what an affectionate sneer he treats that Government. It can scarcely be considered as irony, it is so broad and undisguised: —

"Prussia being less jealous, and consequently more impartial, has constantly shown by her opinions that she has a just idea of the nature and importance of the affairs of the East, and if the Court of Vienna had shared her views and her good intentions, there can be no doubt that the plan of the Imperial Cabinet would have been accomplished."

Fortunate it is for Europe and the world that she has not shared her views upon the present occasion, but, on the contrary, has persuaded Prussia to adopt a more wise and generous policy.

At a subsequent period Count Nesselrode, in the despatch to which I have already referred, speaking of what I may call Prussia's subserviency to the Emperor, expresses himself in these terms: —

"The Count Alopeus transmits to us the most positive assurances, which leave no doubt touching the favorable dispositions on which Russia may reckon on the part of Prussia, whatever may be the ultimate course of events."

These passages present a striking picture of the cautious policy, and at the same time of the industry, unwearied activity, and energy, of the Russian Government. Acting upon these opinions, the invasion of the Principalities, after a short but necessary interval, was decided upon, and the armies of Russia, without opposition from any European power, passed the Balkan, and dictated the degrading and disastrous terms of the Treaty of Adrianople.

Place Russia there upon the termination of the present war in the position she then held, and which is so forcibly described by Count Nesselrode in his secret despatch to the Grand Duke, and what can you reasonably expect, when a convenient opportunity occurs, but further encroachments on the Sultan, and, ultimately, the entire subjugation of the European portion of his empire?

But then this paper refers to some projected guarantee — some treaty, to which the four powers and Russia are to be parties, for the maintenance of the independence of the Sultan and the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. Now, my lords, I fully admit, as to the four powers, that as long as they continue united in friendship and policy, such a guarantee might afford effectual security against the ambitious designs of Russia; but, if circumstances should occur to disturb this union, and, in the ever-varying events of the world, to create rival or hostile feelings among them, there would at once be an end of this security. And as to the guarantee of Russia, or the obligation of any treaty into which she might enter, who is to be found so weak, so credulous, as to place the least reliance upon it? It would be utterly valueless; not worth the paper upon which it was written.

As to trusting in this power, whether we look to recent or more remote events, we come to the same conclusion. Sir Hamilton Seymour, our able and observant minister at St. Petersburg, had learned, from various authentic sources, that large bodies of Russian troops were moving towards the Turkish frontiers. In communicating upon this matter with Count Nesselrode, he was told by that minister that he must have been misinformed; that these movements were nothing more than a change of quarters, usual at that season of the year. In commenting upon this statement, Sir Hamilton Seymour observes, in his despatch to my noble friend, that he found it impossible to reconcile the facts

which had come to his knowledge with the assurances of the Russian minister. The result abundantly proved the correctness of the information.

In the course of an interesting conversation that occurred in this House some weeks since, a noble friend of mine on the cross-bench, enlarged, with much eloquence, and in a strain of high feeling, upon the unworthiness of entertaining doubts of the integrity and honor of illustrious persons with whom we were negotiating in matters of public and national interest. I listened with pleasure to the charms of his brilliant declamation, which reminded me forcibly of former days, but remained unconvinced by his reasoning.

In the intercourse of private life, liberal confidence in those with whom we converse and associate is the characteristic of a gentleman; but in the affairs of nations, where the interests and welfare of millions are at stake, where the rise or fall of empires may depend upon the issue, those who are intrusted with the conduct of such negotiations must be guided by a different and a stricter rule. Their duty in such a position is to exercise caution, vigilance, jealousy. "Oh, for the good old parliamentary word 'jealousy,'" exclaimed Mr. Fox, in one of those bursts of feeling so usual with him, "instead of its modern substitute, 'confidence.'" And if such be the true policy, which I think it is as between Parliament and the ministers of the Crown, how much more ought it to prevail in the conflicting affairs of nations, where such mighty interests are concerned. If confidence, with its natural tendency, should sink into credulity, to what disastrous results might it not lead?

But, in the case of Russia, in particular, and in negotiations with that Government, nothing but the extreme of blindness and credulity could lead to a departure from these principles. The whole series of her history, from the earliest period to the present day, has been one long-continued course of fraud and perfidy, of stealthy encroachment, or open and unblushing violence — a course, characteristic of a barbarous race, and, whether at St. Petersburg or Tobolsk, marking its Asiatic origin. To go back to the reign of the Empress Catherine, we find her policy in one striking particular corresponding with that of the present Emperor, and which policy may in truth be traced back to the Czar Peter. She ostentatiously proclaimed herself the Protector of the Greek Church in Poland, fomented religious dissensions among

the people, and, under pretense of putting an end to disorders which she herself had created, sent a large military force into the country, and gradually stripped it of some of its fairest possessions. I need not add a word as to the ultimate and disastrous issue of these intrigues — the impression they created is strong and will be lasting.

With a like policy in the Crimea, the independence of which country had been settled by treaty, she set up a prince whom she afterwards deposed, and, amidst the confusion thus created, entered the country with an army under the command of one of the most brutal and sanguinary of her commanders, and, having slaughtered all who opposed her, annexed this important district permanently to the Russian Empire. While these proceedings were going on, she prevented, by means of her fleet, all communication with Constantinople, being at peace with the Sultan, with whom she was at that time negotiating a treaty of commerce.

I pass over the extensive conspiracy in which Russia was engaged with Persia and other powers in the East in the years 1834 and 1835 against this country, while she professed to be on terms of the closest friendship with us. These scandalous transactions were strenuously denied by Count Nesselrode to our minister at St. Petersburg, but were afterwards conclusively established by Sir Alexander Burnes and by our consul at Candahar. To enter into details upon this complicated subject would lead me too far from my present object.

But I cannot forbear adverting to the designs of Russia upon Khiva, an inconsiderable place in the desert, east of the Caspian. I recollect the expressions of Mr. Pitt, in alluding to Bonaparte, who, after taking possession of Malta, seized a barren rock in the Mediterranean on his passage to Egypt. "Nothing," he exclaimed, "is too vast for the temerity of his ambition, nothing too small for the grasp of his rapacity" — expressions no less applicable to the restless and insatiable ambition of Russia. Russia sacrificed two armies in endeavoring to reach this remote place. For what purpose? Not with a view to any beneficial trade, but evidently as a convenient centre from which to form combinations and carry on intrigues for the disturbance of our Eastern empire. She has at length, by sending an expedition in a different direction, succeeded in obtaining a footing in that district, the preparations for the enterprise having been made while she was in apparent friendship with our Government.

As to Turkey, it is now known from recent disclosures that, while the Emperor Nicholas was amusing the Sultan with smooth words, and expressing the strongest desire to maintain her independence, he was secretly plotting her destruction and the partition of her empire.

Again, my lords, assurances were given that Prince Menchikoff's mission related solely to the settlement of the question of the Holy Places; but while thus engaged, he endeavored by menaces to force the Turkish Government into a secret convention, the effect of which would have been to make the Emperor joint sovereign with the Sultan. It was afterwards admitted by Count Nesselrode, in contradiction to what he had before stated, that the Emperor regarded this as the most important object of the mission.

After this review of the deceptive policy of Russia, and these instances of her total disregard of national faith, instances which might have been carried to a much greater extent, I ask with confidence what reliance can be placed upon any engagement or guarantee into which she may enter, should it at any moment become her interest, or should she consider it her interest, to disregard it.

But Russia, carrying diplomacy to the extremest point of refinement, has introduced a new and significant term into that mysterious science, namely, the term, "material guarantee." If the Emperor will give a guarantee of this description, something solid and substantial, as a pledge of his fidelity,— something that he would be unwilling to forfeit,— such a guarantee might enable us to hope for a secure and lasting peace; but to rely upon a mere paper guarantee,— a mere pledge of his Imperial word,— would, your lordships must feel, be the extreme of folly and weakness.

I may possibly be asked: What are your views, what do you look forward to as the results of this great struggle? My answer is, that I cannot, in my position, presume to offer an opinion upon such a subject. It is obvious that these results must depend upon the events, the contingencies of the war. But I may venture to say negatively that, unless compelled by the most unforeseen and disastrous circumstances, we ought not to make peace until we have destroyed the Russian fleet in the Black Sea and razed the fortifications by which it is protected. As long as Russia possesses that fleet, and retains that position, it will be

idle to talk of the independence of the Sultan — Russia will continue to hold Turkey in subjection, and compel her to yield obedience to her will.

What course Austria will finally pursue, however I may hope, I will not venture to predict. She has far more at stake in this conflict than either England or France. Should Russia succeed in retaining the Principalities, and in increasing her influence on the southern frontier of Austria, the independence of that empire will be at an end. If this overgrown and monstrous power, extending over so many thousand miles from west to east, pressing, as it does, on the northern boundary of Austria, should coil itself round her eastern and southern limits, she must yield to its movements or be crushed in its folds.

What Russia may further attempt, if successful in her present efforts, time alone can disclose. That she will not remain stationary we may confidently predict. Ambition, like other passions, grows by what it feeds upon. Prince Lieven, in the despatch to Count Nesselrode, to which I before alluded, says: —

"Europe contemplates with awe this colossus, whose gigantic armies wait only the signal to pour like a torrent upon her kingdoms and states."

If this semibarbarous people, with a government of the same character, disguised under the thin cover of a showy but spurious refinement — a government opposed to all beneficial progress and improvement, and which prohibits by law the education of the great body of its subjects — a despotism the most coarse and degrading that ever afflicted mankind — if this power with such attributes should establish itself in the heart of Europe (which may Heaven in its mercy avert!) it would be the heaviest and most fatal calamity that could fall on the civilized world.

135403

PN
6121
B85
v.7

Brewer, David J.
The world's best
orations.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT TYLER
0 00 00 0022013 7